

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XV, 2.

WHOLE NO. 58.

I.—THE LATIN PROHIBITIVE.

PART I.

This paper owes its origin to a feeling the writer has long had that certain uses of the Latin perfect subjunctive are very inadequately and, in some particulars, very inaccurately treated in Latin grammars. It is customary, for instance, in dealing with *ne* and the 2d person subjunctive in prohibitions, to dismiss the subject with the statement that when the prohibition is addressed to no definite person, the present tense is used; otherwise the perfect. All attempts—like Gildersleeve's,¹ for instance—to make any further distinction between the tenses have been frowned down. Scholars in general have been inclined to accept the views of Madvig (*Opusc. acad. altera*, p. 105)² and of Weissenborn (on Livy 21, 44, 6) as final, viz. that the perfect is used, when a definite person is addressed, only because the present cannot be used. The reason for this remarkable state of things they do not trouble themselves to seek. Even Schmalz, in the second edition of his *Lat. Synt.*, §31, would have it understood that the perfect tense in this use has no special significance. Such ignoring of all distinction between tenses is common also in other constructions, e. g. in the so-called potential subjunctive.

¹ Latin Grammar, §266, Rem. 2, which is, as far as it goes, in perfect harmony with the results reached in this paper.

² Madvig is inexcusably careless in some of his statements in this connection. On p. 105, e. g., he says that *ne* with the present is *apud ipsos comicos rarissimum et paene inusitatum*. As a matter of fact, it is extremely common *apud comicos*—far more so than any other form of prohibition.

One of the latest grammars (Allen and Greenough, §311) says that in *aliquis dicat* and *aliquis dixerit* the two tenses *refer without distinction* to the immediate future. The same grammar, in dealing with modest assertion, draws no distinction between *putaverim* and *putem*. It is customary, again, to dismiss the perfect subjunctive in prayers with the mere statement that it is a reminiscence of archaic formulae, without a hint that the perfect necessarily means anything. It has seemed to me that this looseness of interpretation is entirely at variance with the facts of the language, and I have accordingly undertaken an investigation of the whole range of those independent constructions of the perfect subjunctive in which that tense deals with future time. I have included also in my investigation such uses of the future perfect indicative as are frequently said to be 'equivalent to the simple future.' For the purposes of the paper I have collected and classified all the instances of the uses concerned that are to be found in all the remains of the Latin language up to the end of the Augustan period (except the later inscriptions), together with important parts of Silver Latin. I ought perhaps to say that for four volumes of the Teubner text I accepted a collection of instances made by one of my students. He is, however, one in whose care and accuracy I have great confidence, and I feel sure that his collection is substantially complete.

That part of my investigation the results of which I have chosen for the present paper deals chiefly with the 2d person, present and perfect tenses, of the subjunctive in prohibitions. For the purpose of simplifying the discussion I shall, for the present, exclude the few cases (commonly called prohibitions and classed under *ne* with the subjunctive) introduced by *nec*, *numquam*, *nihil* (e. g. *nec dixeris*, *nec putaveris*). There are so serious objections to explaining any one of those introduced by *nec* (*neque*) in the best prose-writers, and some of those introduced by *nihil*, *numquam*, as instances of the same construction as that found in *ne feceris*, that I shall leave the discussion of such cases for Part II of my paper.

The impression is very generally given that *ne* with the perfect subjunctive is one of the most common methods of expressing prohibition in the best classical prose. As a matter of fact, it is almost entirely unknown to such prose. It will be understood, of course, that the Letters of Cicero do not represent the usage of what is understood by 'classical prose.' Tyrrell has clearly

shown that the diction and constructions in the Letters are the diction and constructions of the early comic drama, and not at all those of what is commonly meant by Ciceronian Latin. Indeed, Cicero himself calls especial attention to the wide difference in this respect between them and his other productions in *ad fam.* IX 21, 1 *Quid enim simile habet epistola aut iudicio aut contioni? . . . Epistolas vero cottidianis verbis texere solemus.* We must not consider these Letters in determining the usage of the best classical prose, any more than we should the usage of early comedy: they, as well as the comedy, reflect the language of familiar every-day life. Throwing the Letters aside, we may say that *ne* with the 2d person perfect subjunctive does not occur in any production, whether prose or poetry, of the whole Ciceronian period, except in seven dialogue passages of Cicero where the tone distinctly sinks to that of ordinary conversation, or unceremonious ordering.¹ If, in addition to these, we except four instances in Horace, we may say that it does not occur between Terence and Livy. It is not to the point to say that a prohibition is in its very nature familiar, nor would such a statement be true. The orations and the philosophical and rhetorical productions of Cicero, as well as the productions of other writers belonging to the same period, abound with prohibitions. The orations of Cicero alone contain 81 prohibitions (or probably twice this number if we count such expressions as *quaeso ne facias*, *obsecro ne*, etc.), and still in his orations no instance can be found of *ne* with the perfect subjunctive except in *pro Murena* 31, where Cicero is quoting the supposed words of a teacher to his pupil.

Again, the grammar-rule which says that the present tense is used when the prohibition is general, i. e. addressed to no one in particular, while the perfect is used when it is addressed to some particular person, or persons, is entirely misleading in the form in which it is given. The grain of truth which the rule contains is rendered useless by the absence of any hint as to the principle involved. Sometimes general prohibitions take the perfect tense, e. g. *Cato de agri cultura* 4 *ne siveris*; 37, 1 *ne indideris*; 45, 2 *ne feceris*; 93 *ne addideris*; 113, 2 *ne siveris*; 158, 2 *ne addideris*; 161, 2 *ne sarueris*; XII *Tabulae*, quoted in *Serv. in Verg.*

¹ There is no manuscript authority whatever for *ne siris* (*Catullus* 66, 91). The manuscript reading *non siris* is the true one. This matter will be fully discussed in Part II of my paper.

Ecl. 8, 99 Unde est in XII tabulis: "Neve alienam segetem pellexeris"; Cic. pro Murena 31, 65 Etenim isti ipsi mihi videntur vestri praeceptores et virtutis magistri, fines officiorum paulo longius, quam natura vellet, protulisse . . . "Nihil ignoveris": immo aliquid, non omnia. "Misericordia commotus ne sis": etiam, in dissolvenda severitate: sed tamen est laus aliqua humanitatis (quoting general precepts of the '*vestri praeceptores*' which had just been mentioned. Notice the singular verb side by side with *vestri* (instead of *tui*), which seems to show that the prohibition is general); Hor. Sat. 2, 2, 16 Quae virtus et quanta, boni, sit vivere parvo discite . . . hic inpransi mecum disquirite. Cur hoc? Dicam, si potero . . . seu pila velox . . . seu te discus agit . . . sperne cibum vilem; nisi Hymettia mella Falerno *ne biberis* diluta. On the other hand, it is probable that prohibitions addressed to definite persons occasionally take the present tense at all periods of the literature, and that this use is not, even in classical times, confined to poetry, as is commonly supposed. At any rate, there are passages in prose which it requires ingenuity or violence to explain in any other way, and which, if found in Plautus or Terence, no one would have thought of explaining in any other way. This use is very common in early comedy, and I have collected the following instances from Cicero and later prose: Cic. in Verr. II 4, 23, 52 Scuta si quando conquiruntur a privatis in bello ac tumultu, tamen homines inviti dant, etsi ad salutem communem dari sentiunt. *Ne quem putetis* sine maximo dolore argentum caelatum domo quod alter eriperet protulisse; ib. de republica 6, 12, 12 "St! quaeso," inquit, "*ne* me e somno *excitetis* et parumper audite cetera" (where the imperative '*audite*' instead of a subordinate subjunctive makes it probable that *ne excitetis* is also independent); id. ad fam. 1, 9, 23 Quod rogas, ut mea tibi scripta mittam, quae post discessum tuum scripserim, sunt orationes quaedam, quas Menocrito dabo, neque ita multae; *ne pertimescas*; ib. 16, 9, 4 Reliquum est, ut te hoc rogem et a te petam: *ne* temere *naviges*—solent nautae festinare quaestus sui causa—cautus sis, mi Tiro—mare magnum et difficile tibi restat—si poteris, cum Mescinio (*naviges*)—caute is solet navigare (where *cautus sis* and the form taken by the rest of the sentence show that *ne naviges* also is probably independent); id. ad Att. 9, 18, 3 "Tu malum," inquires, "actum *ne agas*" (a proverb applied here to a particular person); id. ad Quintum fratrem 1, 4, 1 Amabo te, mi frater, *ne* . . . *adsignes* (Cicero never uses

amare in this sense with a dependent clause, though its parenthetical use is common in his Letters with independent imperative constructions, e. g. ad Att. 2, 2, 1 cura, amabo te, Ciceronem; ib. 16, 16c Amabo te, da mihi et hoc; ib. 10, 10, 3; ad Quint. 2, 8, [10])¹; Phil. II 5, 10 *ne putetis* (most naturally taken as independent); Livy 44, 22 Vos quae scripsero senatui aut vobis habete pro certis. Rumores credulitate vestra *ne alatis*, quorum auctor nemo exstabit (This, or some reading which involves the same construction, seems inevitably correct, and would undoubtedly be accepted by everybody were it not for the supposed rule); ib. 22, 39, 2 Armatus intentusque sis, *neque* occasione tuae *desis* *neque* suam occasionem hosti *des* (Livy and later writers freely use *neque* for *neve*); Tac. Dialogus 17 Ex quo colligi potest et Corvinum ab illis et Asinium audiri potuisse (nam Corvinus in medium usque Augusti principatum, Asinius paene ad extremum duravit). *Ne dividatis* saeculum, et antiquos ac veteres vocitetis oratores quos eorundem hominum aures adgnosceret ac velut coniungere et copulare potuerunt. It was formerly customary among editors of the Dialogus to punctuate this sentence as above. Recent editors use only a comma or a semicolon before *ne dividatis*, understand an ellipsis (i. e. *Haec dico ne*, etc.), and thus make Tacitus use a very awkward sentence. Why make this so difficult? Why not let it be what it seems to be on the face of it, namely, a prohibition?

Here, then, are several instances in prose of the present subjunctive with *ne* addressed to a definite person. The reason why it is not more common will appear later on in this discussion. But even if none of these examples existed (and there have been ingenious attempts to explain away most of them in deference to the supposed rule), there would still be no ground for such a rule. In the whole field of classical prose from the beginning of the Ciceronian period to the end of the Augustan period, and even later, there is but a single example of *ne* with the indefinite 2d person present subjunctive in a prohibition. There are a few examples from poetry, but these have no bearing upon the point in question, as it is everywhere acknowledged that *ne* with the present is common in poetry even in addressing a definite person. The single example just referred to is of course the one cited under this rule, with suspicious uniformity, by all Latin gram-

¹ Even in Plautus and Terence *amabo* in this sense is almost invariably thrown in parenthetically.

mars, viz. Cic. Cato Maior 10, 33, though even here it might be noticed that Cato is speaking to definite persons, addressing at one time Scipio individually, again Laelius, and still again both together. The truth is that a general prohibition in Latin is nearly always expressed by the use of the 3d person, e. g. *ne quis pulet*, etc., or some circumlocution introduced by *cavendum est ne*, or the like. It will, I think, be admitted that the above considerations at least cast serious doubt upon the validity of the grammar-rules regarding the use of *ne* in prohibitions. The question as to the true distinction between the tenses in such constructions seems to me to be still an open one, and this paper is intended as a contribution to its solution.

Let us start with certain general principles. All will agree that the perfect subjunctive, when dealing with a future act, differs, at least in some uses, from the present in representing the act as one finished in the future. For instance, in the expression *si venerit, videat* the act of coming is conceived of as a finished act in the future, about to be completed prior to the beginning of the act of seeing. In *si veniat*, on the other hand, the act is conceived of as in progress in the future. Such a distinction between the tenses of *ne feceris* and *ne facias* would not be entirely satisfactory at all points of the parallel. *Ne feceris* cannot mean literally 'Do not prior to a certain point in the future, have done it.' In one respect, however, the distinction, it seems to me, still holds. In *ne feceris* there is at least no thought of the progress of the act. The expression deals with an act in its entirety. The beginning, the progress and the end of the act are brought together and focussed in a single conception. The idea of the act is not dwelt upon, but merely touched, for an instant, and then dismissed. The speaker, as it were, makes short work of the thought. There is a certain impetus about the tense. When a man says *ne facias* he is taking a comparatively calm, dispassionate view of an act conceived of as one that will possibly *be taking place* in the future; *ne feceris*, on the other hand, implies that the speaker cannot abide the thought; he refers to it only for the purpose of insisting that it be dismissed absolutely as one not to be harbored. As far as the comparative vigor of the two expressions is concerned, the difference in feeling between them is similar to that between 'Go!' and 'Be gone!' 'Go' dwells upon the progress of the act. A man never says 'Be gone!' except when aroused by

strong emotion, which does not allow him to think of the progress of the act, but only the prompt accomplishment of it. In a similar way *ne feceris* betrays stronger feeling than *ne facias*—it disposes of the thought with the least possible ado. The same distinction should be made between *cave feceris* and *cave facias*. This feature of the tense, if my characterization of it is correct, would lead us to expect it to be used only, or chiefly, in animated, emotional, or unusually earnest discourse, and to such passages, as we shall presently see, is it almost exclusively confined. I wish to insist upon this as the only real distinction between the two tenses with *ne*. We shall now, of course, expect that in the majority of cases where a prohibition is a general, indefinite one, the present tense will be found. When a man is soberly philosophizing and writing precepts for the world at large, he is not often aroused by emotions so strong as he is when, actually face to face with a person and perhaps under the influence of anger, alarm or some other intense feeling, he orders that person not to do a certain thing. But even in this sort of writing, when he feels that his precept is of prime importance, he may occasionally fall into the more vigorous form of expression. For the satisfactory study of such expressions we look for some production abounding in general precepts, and still not written in the form of dialogue and not addressed to any one in particular. Naturally we turn to Cato's *de agri cultura*. In the seven different passages of this work cited above, Cato uses *ne* with the perfect in a general prohibition. In each case the context makes it probable, or, in the light of facts which I shall present later, practically certain, that he considers of especial importance the particular thing prohibited, e. g. ch. 4, where he is trying to show how a farmer may live happy and prosperous: *ruri si recte habitaveris, libentius venies: fundus melior, minus peccabitur, fructi plus capies. Frons occipitio prior est: vicinis bonus esto: familiam ne siveris peccare. Si te libenter vicinitas videbit, facilius tua vendes, operas facilius locabis etc.*, i. e. '*above all things, do not allow* the members of your household to offend them. If you keep on good terms with your neighbors, you will find it easier to sell your produce,' etc.; again, 37, 1: 'If you are dealing with land that is *cariosa*, peas are a bad crop to put in; so are barley, hay, etc.; *above all things, do not put in nuts (nucleos ne indideris).*' Everywhere else in his treatise he uses the less vigorous forms of prohibition, sometimes *nolito* with the infinitive, sometimes *ne* with the

2d imperative, sometimes *caveto* with the present tense of the subjunctive. He never uses the perfect tense with *caveto*, though this tense with *cave* is far more common in Plautus than the present. The present tense, on the other hand, occurs in Cato 17 times.

By far the best place to study the difference in meaning between the two tenses is in Plautus and Terence, because in them (and only in them) both tenses are very freely used with *ne* and *cave* in prohibitions. It is there, too, that the tone of the prohibition can best be determined, because the dramatic action makes clear the feeling of the speaker. I give below classified lists of all the passages in Plautus and Terence containing prohibitions of this sort.¹ In studying these lists, there are certain considerations which should be kept constantly in mind. In all but a comparatively few cases, the distinction I have drawn between the perfect and the present tenses will be very clear. But of course some instances, both of the perfect and of the present, will be found near the border-line. In some cases where the speaker is moved by only slight emotion, one tense would be as appropriate and natural as the other. Again, a speaker may be somewhat aroused while still under perfect self-control and realizing the advisability of calm language. On the other hand, a speaker may be really very calm, while wishing, for certain purposes, to seem very indignant. We should also bear in mind a natural tendency to unceremoniousness and a vigorous off-hand style in every-day conversation between friends and in the language of superiors to inferiors. If we keep in mind these considerations, a comparison of the following lists will, I think, inevitably lead to the conclusion that the distinction I have drawn is the true one.

There are in Plautus and Terence 31 instances of *ne* with the perfect subjunctive. In nearly all of these the feeling of strong emotion of some sort—e. g. great alarm, fear of disaster if the prohibition is not complied with, or the like—is very prominent. Many of them are accompanied by other expressions which betray the speaker's earnestness, e. g. *per deos atque homines*, *opsecro*, *hercle*, etc. And there is not one of them in the least inconsistent with my explanation of the meaning of the tense. Plautus has this construction in the following passages²: Am. 924

¹ I was surprised to find no instance of this use in the tragedies of Seneca, who, I believe, uses only *ne* with the imperative (or *vide ne* with the subjunctive) in prohibitions.

² I have not thought it necessary for my present purpose to make a separate class of such aorists as *dixis*, *parvis*, etc.

Per dexteram tuam te, Alcumena, oro, opsecro te, da mi hanc veniam, *irata ne sies* (evidently here the perfect of *irascor*. The fact that this verb is inchoative in form does not militate against the principle I have laid down, as it is seldom inchoative [never so, if we may trust Harpers' Dict.] in meaning. It commonly means to *feel angry*. When the beginning of the act is referred to *incipio*, or a verb of similar meaning is used with it, e. g. ad Att. 4, 1, 8 *incipiunt irasci*. Inchoative verbs are not found in this construction); Miles 283 Sc. Nescis tu fortasse, apud nos facinus quod natumst novom. PAL. Quod id est facinus? Sc. Impudicum. PAL. (not wanting to hear such news) Tute sci soli tibi: Mihi *ne dixis*. Notice the many indications of earnest feeling: *Tute* (*tu* alone even would have been emphatic) *soli tibi*, and all sharply contrasted with *mihi*; ib. 862 Perii: excruciat me erus . . . Fugiam hercle . . . *ne dixeritis*, opsecro, huic vostram fidem! ib. 1333: Here Philocomasium has just fainted and fallen into the arms of her lover, at the thought of leaving him. All is excitement. One says: Run for some water. The lover exclaims: *ne inter- veneris*, quaeso, dum resipiscit; Rudens 1155 Perii in primo praelio: mane! *ne ostenderis*! Here his possession of the treasure that has been found depends, as he thinks, upon its not being shown; Trin. 521 Per deos atque homines dico, *ne* tu illunc agrum tuom *siris* umquam fieri; ib. 704 (Lysiteles in a quarrel with Lesbonicus, indignant at the suggestion of anything which might reflect upon his character) Id me commissurum ut patiar fieri *ne* animum *induxeris*; ib. 1012 *Ne destiteris* currere (addressed to himself in fear of a flogging. All his words at this point indicate hurry and alarm); Asin. 839 SON (in a tone of earnest deprecation, in answer to his father's taunt): *Ne dixis* istuc. FATHER: *Ne sic fueris*: ilico ego non dixero; Curc. 599 PLANESIUM (to Phaedromus, in great fear lest the parasite escape with the stolen ring) . . . propera! . . . Parasitum *ne amiseris*! Pseud. 79 Id quidem hercle *ne parsis*! Most. 1083 THEOPROPIDES (angry, and resolved to punish Tranio, trying to get him away from the altar, where he had taken refuge): Surge . . . *ne occupassis*, opsecro, aram . . . surgedum hinc . . . surge: *ne* nugare. Aspicendum; Men. 415 *Ne feceris*! periisti, si intrassis intra limen; ib. 617 PE. (during an angry dispute) At tu *ne* clam me *commissis* prandium. ME. Non taces? PE. Non hercle vero taceo; Epid. 150 (in answer to Stratippocles' intimation that he would commit suicide) *ne feceris*! ib. 593 PER. Si hercle

te umquam audivero me patrem vocare, vitam tuam ego interimam. FID. Non voco ... *ne fueris* pater; Poen. 552 (the lawyers, speaking with professional decisiveness and importance) Nos tu *ne curassis!* scimus rem omnem. The tone assumed here by the speakers may be inferred from the fact that they have just been accused of speaking with too much anger (cf. vs. 540 *nimis iracundi estis*); ib. 990 *ne parseris*; Aul. 100 (Euclio having a large amount of gold concealed in his house, is constantly alarmed lest it be stolen. He bids his servant again and again not, under any circumstances, to let any one enter the house) Si bona Fortuna veniat, *ne intromiseris!* ib. 577 EUC. (still in fear of losing his treasure) *Ne in me mutassis* nomen! ib. 737 LYC. (upon Euclio's threatening him with death) *Ne istuc dixis!* ib. 790 *Ne me uno digito adtigeris*, ne te ad terram, scelus, adfligam! Cas. 2, 6, 52 ST. Praecide os tu illi! Age! CLE. (trying to prevent a fight) *Ne obiexis* manum! Cist. 1, 1, 111 Silenium (speaking of her lover, with great depth of feeling that moves her hearers to tears [vs. 113]) sed, amabo, tranquille; *ne* quid, quod illi doleat, *dixeris!* The following seems near the borderline, one tense being as appropriate as the other: Merc. 396 *ne duas neu te advexisse dixeris.*

Terence has only two instances of *ne* with the perfect: Phorm. 514 Unam praeterea horam *ne oppertus sies.* The speaker is fairly beside himself throughout this scene, which sufficiently accounts for the more emotional form of expression. Ib. 742 (alarmed by fear lest his treachery be discovered) *Ne me istoc posthac nomine appellassis.*

The same feeling that prompts the use of the perfect tense in the passages just cited, explains the use of the same tense in prohibitions introduced by *cave*. Plautus and Terence present 33 instances of *cave* with the perfect: Plaut. Am. 608; Miles 1125; 1245; 1368; 1372; Trin. 513; 555; Asin. 256; 467; 625; Bacch. 402; 910; 1188; Stich. 284; Most. 388; 508; 795; Men. 996; Epid. 400; 434; Merc. 112; 476; Poen. 1020; Aul. 90; 600; 610; Persa 388; 933; Cas. II 5, 24; Ter. And. 753; 760; Haut. 187; Adelph. 458.

If now we turn to *ne* and *cave* with the present subjunctive we find a very different state of things. There are in Plautus and Terence more than 100 instances of *ne*, and 18 (19?) instances of *cave*, in this form of prohibition, as will be seen by consulting the following list: Am. 87 (Prologue addressing the audience) Mirari

nolim vos, quapropter Juppiter nunc histriones curet. *Ne miremini*¹: ipse hanc acturust Juppiter comoediam; ib. 116 (still addressing the audience) *Ne hunc ornatum meum admiremini*; Capt. 14 Ego me tua causa, *ne erres*, non rupturus sum (probably *ne* here means 'lest'); ib. 58 (Prologue) *Ne vereamini*, quia bellum Aetolis esse dixi cum Aleis; ib. 186: The parasite (replying to Hegio, who has good-humoredly warned him not to expect too much at his table): Numquam istoc vinces me, Hegio: *ne postules* cum calceatis dentibus veniam; ib. 331 Filius meus aput vos servit captus: eum si reddis mihi, praeterea unum nummum *ne duis*; ib. 349 Nec quemquam potes mittere ad eum quoi tuom concredat filium audacius. *Ne vereare*: meo periculo ego huius experiar fidem; ib. 393 Istuc *ne praecipias*, facile memoria memini; ib. 854 Nec nihil hodie nec multo plus tu hic edes, *ne frustra sis*; ib. 947 At ob eam rem mihi libellam pro eo argenti *ne duis*: gratiis a me ducito; ib. 957 Fui . . . bonus vir numquam neque frugi bonae neque ero umquam: *ne spem ponas* me bonae frugi fore; Miles 1215 PY. Libertatem tibi ego et divitias dabo, si impetras. PA. Reddam impetratam . . . At modice decet. *Ne sis cupidus*; ib. 1274 Viri quoque armati idem istuc faciunt: *ne tu mirere* mulierem; ib. 1360 PA. Muliebres mores discendi. PY. Fac sis frugi. PA. Iam non possum: amisi omnem lubidinem. PY. I, sequere illos: *ne morere*; ib. 1378 *Ne me moneatis*: memini ego officium meum; ib. 1422 Aliter hinc non ibis: *ne sis frustra*; Rud. 941 Nil habeo, adulescens, piscium: *ne tu mihi esse postules*; ib. 968 GR. Hunc homo nemo a me feret: *ne tu te speres*. TR. Non ferat, si dominus veniat? GR. Dominus huic, *ne* (probably = 'lest') *frustra sis*, nisi ego nemo natust, hunc qui cepi in venatu meo; ib. 992 Quod in mari non natumst neque habet squamas *ne feras*; ib. 1012 Hinc tu nisi malum frunisci nil potes, *ne postules*; ib. 1368 Ut scias gaudere me, mihi triobulum ob eam *ne duis*; ib. 1385 Quod servo meo promisisti, meum esse oportet. *Ne tu, leno, postules*; ib. 1390 DAE. Opera mea haec tibi sunt servata: (GR. Immo hercle mea, *ne tu tua dicas*); ib. 1414 nihil hercle hic tibi, *ne tu speres*; Trin. 16 (Prologue, to audience) de argumento *ne expectetis* fabulae; ib. 267 Apage sis amor. Amor, amicus mihi *ne fuas* umquam; ib. 370 PH. . . . quid dare illi nunc vis? LU. Nil quicquam, pater: Tu modo *ne me prohibeas* accipere, siquid det mihi; Bacch. 747

¹ Some of these might be explained as final clauses ('that you may not be surprised,' I make the following statement, etc.).

... quod promisisti mihi te quaeso ut memineris, *ne illum verberes* (probably a dependent clause); ib. 758 ... ubi erit adcubitum semel, *ne quoquam exurgatis*, donec a me erit signum datum; Curc. 183 PA. Quin tu is dormitum? PH. Dormio: *ne occlames*; ib. 213 Si amas, eme: *ne rogites*; ib. 539 *Ne mihi te facias ferocem aut supplicare censeas*; ib. 565 Nil aput me quidem. *Ne facias testis*: neque equidem dehibeo quicquam; ib. 568 Vapulare ego te vehementer iubeo: *ne me territes*; ib. 713 Non ego te flocci facio; *ne me territes* (the feeling in such cases is not that the failure to comply with '*ne territes*' will be disastrous to me, but that it will do you no good to try to frighten me); Ps. 275 ... scimus nos te qualis sis: *ne praedices*; ib. 1234 Sequere tu. Nunc *ne expectetis*, dum domum redeam; Stich. 320 Tua quod nil refert, *ne cures*; ib. 446 ... id *ne vos miremini*, homines servolos potare etc.; Most. 598 Pater advenit ...: is tibi et faenus et sortem dabit. *Ne inconciliare nos porro postules*; ib. 611 TRA. Huic debet Philolaches paulum. THEOP. Quantillum? TRA. Quadraginta minas. THEOP. Paulum id quidemst? TRA. *Ne sane id multum censeas*; ib. 799 Ergo inridere *ne videare* et gestire admodum; ib. 994 Ad cenam *ne me te vocare censeas*; ib. 1010 THEOP. Minas tibi octoginta argenti debeo. SI. Non mihi quidem hercle: verum si debes, cedo. ... *Ne ire initias postules*; Men. 327 *ne quo abeas longius* ab aedibus; ib. 790 Quid ille faciat, *ne id observes*; Epid. 147 EP. A quo trapezita peto? STRAT. Unde lubet. Nam ni ... (promptseris), meam domum *ne inbilas*; ib. 305 *Ne abitas*, priusquam ego ad te venero; ib. 339 [hoc quidem iam periit, *ne quid tibi hinc in spem referas* (perhaps dependent)]; Merc. 164 CHAR. Quid istuc est mali? ACAN. *Ne rogites*; ib. 318 DEM. Ne me obiurga. LYS. ... non obiurgo. DEM. At *ne deteriore* hoc facto *ducas* (there seems to be slight emotion here; either tense would seem appropriate); ib. 396 *Ne duas* neu te advexisse dixeris (this, like the passage just cited (vs. 318), seems on the border-line. The speaker is really very earnest, but is, as shown by the general situation, anxious not to appear too much so, lest his real motive be guessed. The sudden change of tense, then, is not surprising); ib. 457 Ad portum *ne bitas*, dico iam tibi (perhaps dependent); ib. 520 Nunc, mulier, *ne tu frustra sis*, mea non es; *ne arbitrere*; Poen. 520 *Ne tuo nos amori servos esse addictos censeas*; ib. 526 *Ne tu opinere* (perhaps dependent); ib. 536 Est domi, quod edimus, *ne nos tam contemptim conteras*

(perhaps dependent upon 'I say this,' understood); ib. 1152 Audin tu, patruē? Dico, *ne* dictum *neges* (perhaps dependent); ib. 1370 *Ne mirere*, mulieres, quod eum sequuntur; Aul. 166 Verba *ne facias*, soror; ib. 231 EUCL. At nihil est dotis quod dem. MEG. *Ne duas*, dum modo morata recte veniat, dotatast satis. EUCL. Eo dico, *ne* me thensauros repperisse *censeas*. MEG. Novi; *ne doceas*; ib. 350 Sunt igitur ligna, *ne quaeras* foris; Persa 141 Numquam hercle hodie hic prius edis, *ne frustra sis*; Truc. 477 *Ne exspectetis*, spectatores, meas pugnas dum praedicem; ib. 658 *Ne* me morari *censeas*; ib. 744 Res ita est, *ne frustra sis*; Cas. Prol. 64 (to audience) *Ne exspectetis* etc.; ib. II 6, 42 *Ne* a me *memores* malitiose de hac re factum, aut *suspices*; Cist. II 3, 16 Nam illaec tibi nutrix est: *ne matrem censeas*; ib. V (to audience) *Ne expectetis*, spectatores etc. In Capt. 548 Hegio, hic homo rabiosus habitus est in Alide: *ne* tu quod istic fabuletur auris *inmittas* tuas, and in Miles 1363 (1351) PA. Si forte liber fieri occeperim mittam nuntium ad te: *ne* me *deseras*, there seems to be a certain amount of emotion, but it will be noticed that in each case the speaker is addressing a superior. In the former case, too, the speaker is anxious to appear calm and undisturbed. Furthermore, *ne* might well be taken here in the sense of 'lest.' In the other passage, the slave who is speaking does not even mean what he says. He is really glad that he is going, and never wants to see again the master whom he is addressing. In the light of this fact, *ne deseras* seems cool irony. The stereotyped formula *ne molestus sis* occurs in Plaut. Asin. 469; Ps. 118; 889; Most. 74; 572; 757; 863; 871; Men. 251; Aul. 450; but in nearly all of these instances it might be taken as dependent upon some other verb expressed or understood. In any case, one must not look for strong emotion in so commonplace a phrase. *Ne* with the present subjunctive occurs in Terence in the following passages: And. 704 Huic, non tibi, habeo, *ne erres* (perhaps dependent); ib. 706 Dies hic mihi ut satis sit vereor ad agendum: *ne* vacuum esse me nunc ad narrandum *credas*; ib. 980 (to audience) *Ne exspectetis* dum exeant huc; Eun. 76 Quid agas? nisi ut te redimas captum quam queas minimo: ... et *ne* te *adflictes*; ib. 212 Ego quoque una pereō, quod mihi est carius: *ne* istuc tam iniquo *patiari* animo; ib. 273 GN. Quia tristis es. PA. Nihil quidem. GN. *Ne sis*; ib. 388 Si certumst facere, faciam: verum *ne* post *conferas* culpam in me; ib. 786 Sane quod tibi

nunc vir videatur esse hic, nebulo magnus est: *ne metuas*; ib. 988 Ere, *ne me spectes*: me impulsore haec non facit; Haut. 745 Sy. Ancillas . . . traduce huc propere. DR. Quam ob rem? Sy. *Ne quaeras*; Phorm. 419 "Actum" aiunt "*ne agas*"; Hec. 342 Non visas? *Ne mittas* quidem visendi causa quemquam; Adelph. 22 *Ne exspectetis* argumentum fabulae. In Phorm. 508 Heia, ne parum leno sies, the *ne*-clause is rightly explained by editors as dependent 'Look out there, lest,' etc. Besides these, there are five instances of *ne attigas* which will call for comment later.

Cave with the present tense of the subjunctive occurs as follows: Plaut. Capt. 431; 439; Most. 797; 1012; Epid. 432; Persa 52; 812; Cas. III 1, 16; Poen. 117; Ter. Eun. 751; Haut. 302; 826 (?); Phorm. 993; Adelph. 170.

There are certain remarkable differences between the prohibitions in this latter list (expressed by the present tense) and those in the former list (expressed by the perfect) which a casual observer might not notice. If my distinction between the two tenses is correct, we should expect that a prohibition dealing with mere mental action, e. g. 'Do not suppose,' 'Do not be surprised,' 'Do not be afraid,' would commonly take the present tense, because such prohibitions would not commonly be accompanied by strong emotion, and, as far as the interests of the speaker are concerned, it matters little whether the prohibition be complied with or not. Such a condition of things is exactly what we find. Among the instances of *ne* with the perfect tense, not a single example of a verb of this class will be found; but among those of *ne* with the present there are no less than 31 instances of such verbs, or nearly a third of the entire number. Again, such prohibitions as 'Do not ask me,' 'Do not remind me' (i. e. I know already), would not ordinarily imply any emotion, and no such verbs will be found among the instances of *ne* with the perfect.¹ But there are 13 such verbs among the instances of the present. Substantially the same holds true for the *cave*-constructions. Among the 33 instances of *cave* with the perfect there is no instance of a verb belonging to any of these classes. There is no avoidance of such verbs with *cave* used with the present

¹ The nearest approach to an exception is *iratus ne sies* (Plaut. Am. 924), which seems here to be the perfect tense of *irascor*. Here there is an additional idea of venting one's anger, which removes it, strictly speaking, from the class referred to.

tense (in spite of the fact that there are only about half so many instances of the present as of the perfect), e. g. Ter. Phorm. 993; Haut. 826 (*admiratus* here probably used adjectively, as in ad Att. 9, 12, 2 and Off. 2, 10, 35); Plaut. Asin. 372; Capt. 431 (?); or with *noli* (though *noli* is comparatively rare in Plautus and Terence), e. g. Plaut. Persa 619; Capt. 845; Ter. Phorm. 556; or with *ne* followed by the imperative, a construction which occurs 33 times in Plautus and Terence with such verbs (out of a total of 84 instances): Plaut. Am. 674; 1064; 1110; Capt. 554; Miles 893; 895; 1011; 1345; Rud. 688; 1049; Trin. 1181; Asin. 462; 638; 826; Curc. 520; Ps. 103; 734; 922; Men. 140; Merc. 172; 873; 879; 993; Cas. 4, 4, 14; Most. 629; Truc. 496; Aul. 427; Persa 674; Ter. And. 543; Adelp. 279; 942; Haut. 85 (*bis*).¹ Outside of Plautus and Terence such verbs occur, in the ante-Ciceronian period, as follows: Cato de agr. cult. 1, 4 *caveto contemnās*; ib. 64, 1 *nolito credere* ('do not believe'); Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, I 1445 *credere noli*; ib. 1453 *spernere nolēi*. But nowhere in this whole period is such a verb to be found in the perfect tense in a prohibition. Why this mysterious absence of all such verbs from this one sort of prohibition? Recurring to the instances of the present tense in Plautus and Terence, we notice that in 11 of the passages the prologue, or some one else, is calmly addressing the audience with 'Do not expect me to disclose the plot of the play,' or some prohibition equally calm. But there is not one instance in the prologues either of Plautus or Terence of the

¹ It will be noticed that in Plautus and Terence more than one-third of the verbs in prohibitions expressed by *ne* and the imperative are verbs of fearing (22 of the 33), thinking, asking or advising. Of the remaining verbs, a large proportion are verbs of saying and weeping. A similar state of things prevails in Vergil, who uses this construction 27 times. In 12 of these the verbs belong to the classes just mentioned. All this is interesting in connection with the much-mooted question regarding the relative harshness in Greek of μή with the present imperative and μή with the aorist subjunctive. See Dr. Miller's paper on the Imperative in the Attic Orators, A. J. P. XIII 424. In Latin, *ne* with the perfect subjunctive is harsher than *ne* with the imperative, the latter corresponding rather closely in this respect with *ne* and the present subjunctive. Both of these last-mentioned constructions, however (*ne* with imperat. and *ne* with pres. subj.), smacked somewhat of the same familiar feeling as their sister construction. *Noli* was far more deferential, and Cicero, when he wished to soften the tone of his address, accordingly preferred that form of prohibition.

perfect tense in prohibition. And this again is exactly what we should expect. (It matters little for our present purpose whether Plautus wrote the prologues to his plays or not.) In general the fact may be emphasized that *ne* with the present is chiefly confined to prohibitions of the most commonplace sort. Where this is not apparent from the nature of the verb itself, a study of the context will show that the speaker is not under the influence of any strong emotion. There are in all only 5 instances (a small number out of so many) which can fairly be said to be accompanied by decided emotion, and in each case, strangely enough, the verb is *attigas*, viz. Plaut. Bacch. 445; Most. 453; Epid. 721; Truc. 273; Ter. And. 789. I cannot account for this strange exception, unless one accepts Curtius' suggestion that *attigas* is an aoristic form (Stud. V 433). The few additional passages that might apparently be construed as exceptions have been commented upon under the citation.

Whatever differences of opinion may be held regarding individual instances in the two lists above given, I feel sure that no one who studies them carefully can resist the general conclusion to which I have come. If, now, the distinction I have drawn between the two tenses holds so clearly for the only two authors who make frequent use of *ne* with the subjunctive in prohibitions, a strong presumption is established in favor of a similar distinction in the few instances to be found in later writers, where there are not always so many indications at hand, as in dramatic productions, to make clear the feeling of the writer. And a study of these instances confirms the presumption. There are in classical prose, from the beginning of the Ciceronian period up to near the end of the Augustan period, only seven instances of *ne* with the perfect in prohibition, and these are all in Cicero. As pointed out above, each of these occurs in dialogue where the tone sinks to that of ordinary conversation, in which some one is delivering himself of an earnest, energetic command. One is naturally more unceremonious in addressing a familiar friend than in addressing a mere acquaintance: he falls more readily into energetic forms of expression. Often he assumes an off-hand, imperious tone in such cases merely as a bit of pleasantry. This would be especially natural when one was urging his friend not to do what he feared that friend might do—namely, in prohibitions. One can hardly fail to notice this tone at any talkative gathering of intimate friends. Let us examine now more care-

fully the seven instances referred to: de div. 2, 61, 127 (a supposed command of a god to a man) *hoc ne feceris!* de rep. 1, 19, 32 Si me audietis, adulescentes, solem alterum *ne metueritis!* de leg. 2, 15, 36 (Atticus, replying sharply to Marcus) Tu vero istam Romae legem rogato: nobis nostras *ne ademeris!* Ac. 2, 40, 125 (in conversation with Lucullus at a familiar gathering of friends) Tu vero ista *ne asciveris neve fueris* commenticiis rebus adsensus! Tusc. disp. 1, 47, 112 (replying in a deprecatory tone to a suggestion that has just been made) Tu vero istam *ne reliqueris!* pro Mur. 31, 65 (quotation from the supposed command of a teacher to his pupil) misericordia *commotus ne sis!* (though *sis* alone might be looked upon as the verb here, in which case the construction would belong to the other class); Par. Sto. 5, 3, 41 (in a vigorous protest) tu posse te dicito, debere *ne dixeris*. An unusually earnest and energetic tone is to be found in each one of these. Notice, for instance, the strongly contrasted pronouns and the other indications of strong feeling. The reason why this construction is so rare in classical productions is that they are, for the most part, of a very dignified character. The prohibitions they contain are therefore commonly expressed by *noli* with the infinitive (a construction that occurs 123 times in Cicero, twice in Nepos, three times in Sallust, three times in Caesar), or by *cave* with the present subjunctive (30 times in Cicero, once in Nepos, once in Sallust), or by *vide ne* with the subjunctive (18 times in Cicero, once in Nepos). Next to *noli*, the most common form of prohibition in Cicero is, I should say, some circumlocution like *pelo, rogo, oro*, etc., followed by *ne* and the subjunctive, but I have made no attempt to collect the instances. Even *ne* with the present subjunctive is less deferential than the constructions just named; it smacks somewhat of its sister construction, and so is comparatively rare. Where, next to the early comedy, do we find the most familiar tone prevailing? One may answer, without hesitation, in the Letters of Cicero. And it is in these Letters that most of the instances of *ne* with the perfect in classical times are found. It is also a significant fact, and one, I think, not hitherto noticed, that all but 2 of the 14 instances here found are addressed to his bosom-friends or relatives: 8 of them to Atticus, 2 to his brother Quintus, and 2 to his intimate legal friend Trebatius, upon whom he was always sharpening his wits and whom he never lost an opportunity to abuse, good-naturedly, to his face. One of the two exceptions is in a very impassioned

passage of a letter written by Brutus to Cicero, ad Brut. 1, 16, 6; the other is in ad fam. 7, 25, 2, where Cicero is enjoining upon Fadius Gallus, in the most urgent terms possible, not under any circumstances to reveal a certain secret. To his other correspondents he uses only *noli* or, in two instances, *cave* with the present subjunctive, e. g. to Servius Sulpicius (ad fam. 4, 4, 3), to Lucius Mescinius (ad fam. 5, 21, 1), to Cornificius (ad fam. 12, 30, 1; 12, 30, 3), to Gallus (ad fam. 7, 25, 1; 7, 25, 2), to Brut. 1, 6 twice; 1, 7; 1, 13; 1, 15, 1 twice, etc. Excepting the passionate remonstrance referred to in a letter written by Brutus, the correspondents of Cicero use only *noli* when addressing him, e. g. ad fam. 4, 5, 5; 7, 29; 12, 16, 1. In the treatise ad Herennium, I might add, *ne* never occurs in prohibition, though other forms of prohibition are common, e. g. *noli* in 4, 30, 41; 4, 41, 53 twice; 4, 52, 65; 4, 54, 67; *cave*, or *vide*, *ne* with the present subjunctive in 4, 3, 5; 4, 4, 6. Following is a complete list of the instances of *ne* with the perfect in Cicero's Letters, nearly all of which show great earnestness, either real or assumed: ad Att. 2, 5, 1 Etiam hercule est in non accipiendo non nulla gloria: qua re si quid Θεοφάνης tecum forte contulerit *ne* omnino *repudiaris*; ib. 5, 11, 7 nam illam νομάρδια (?) me excusationem *ne* *acceperis*; ib. 9, 9, 1 Quod vereri videris *ne* mihi tua consilia displiceant, me vero nihil delectat aliud nisi consilium et litterae tuae; qua re fac, ut ostendis: *ne* *destiteris* ad me quicquid tibi in mentem venerit scribere: mihi nihil potest esse gratius (Notice the emphatic position of words, indicative of strong feeling); ib. 10, 13, 1 Epistola tua gratissima fuit meae Tulliae, et mehercule mihi: semper secum aliquam (?) adferunt tuae litterae. Scribes igitur ac, si quid ad spem poteris, *ne* *demiseris*. Tu Antoni leones pertimescas *cave*; ad Brut. 1, 16, 6 Me vero posthac *ne* *commendaveris* Caesari tuo, *ne* te quidem ipsum, si me audies. Valde care aestimas tot annos, quot ista aetas recipit, si propter eam causam puero isti supplicaturus es; ad fam. 7, 17, 2 Hunc tu virum nactus, si me aut sapere aliquid aut velle tua causa putas, *ne* *dimiseris*; ib. 7, 25, 2 Sed heus tu . . . secreto hoc audi, tecum habeto, *ne* Apellae quidem, liberto tuo, *dixeris*; ad Quint. 1, 4, 5 Sin te quoque inimici vexare coeperint, *ne* *cessaris*; non enim gladiis tecum, sed litibus agetur; ad Att. 1, 9 *ne* *dubitaris* mittere ('Do not for a moment hesitate,' etc.); ib. 4, 15, 6 Veni in spec-taculum, primum magno et aequabili plausu—sed hoc *ne* *curaris*; ego ineptus, qui scripserim; ib. 7, 3, 2 Quin nunc ipsum non

dubitabo rem tantam abicere, si id erit rectius; utrumque vero simul agi non potest, et de triumpho ambitiose et de re publica libere. Sed *ne dubitaris* quin, quod honestius, id mihi futurum sit antiquius; ad Quintum fratrem 2, 10, 5 Iocum autem illius de sua egestate *ne sis aspernatus* (Cicero is here speaking of Caesar, which sufficiently accounts for his vigorous tone). In ad Att. 16, 2, 5 Planco et Oppio scripsi equidem, quoniam rogaras, sed, si tibi videbitur, *ne necesse habueris* reddere, we should have expected the present. Here, however, it might be noticed that the first hand of the Medicean manuscript (M), the highest possible manuscript authority and in fact the only authority of much importance, omits the *ne*. In ad fam. 7, 18, 3 Tu, si intervallum longius erit mearum litterarum, *ne sis admiratus*, *sis* is probably the verb, *admiratus* being here used adjectively, as in ad Att. 9, 12, 2 sum admiratus ('I am surprised'), and in Off. 2, 10, 35 *ne quis sit admiratus* etc.

Most of the instances to be found, in the prose of classical times, of *ne* with the 2d person present subjunctive in prohibitions have been cited earlier in this paper. The following should be added to complete the list: Cic. Cato Maior 10, 33 *ne requiras*; ib. ad Att. 2, 24, 1 *ne sis* (*perturbatus* perhaps here used adjectively, like the following *sollicitus* and *anxius*). There are a large number of other passages that might well be explained as instances of the same use, e. g. ad Att. 14, 1, 2 Tu, quaeso, quicquid novi scribere *ne pigrescere* (which Madvig, Opus. 2, p. 107, and Kühner, Lat. Gram. II, §47, 8, actually explain as independent of *quaeso*); Phil. II 5, 10; pro Cluentio 2, 6 *ne repugnetis* etc. That *ne* with the present subjunctive is not more common in the best prose is due to an increasing fondness for the *noli*-construction. *Ne* with the present was a mild prohibition as compared with *ne* with the perfect, but it was less deferential and respectful than *noli*, and in dignified address *noli* accordingly became the regular usage. In early comedy there was comparatively little call for the more calm and dignified forms of expression, and there accordingly we find that *noli* is comparatively rare. It occurs in Plautus and Terence only in addressing some one who must be gently handled. It is found only where the tone is one of pleading—it never conveys an order, in the strict sense of that word. It is almost never used by a superior in addressing an inferior. In the two or three exceptions to this rule, the superior has some motive for adopting

the mild tone. Those who wish to test the truth of these remarks are referred to the following complete list of the instances of *noli* in Plautus and Terence: Plaut. Am. 520; 540; Capt. 845; Miles 372; 1129; Trin. 627; Asin. 417; Curc. 128; 197; 697; Most. 800; Merc. 922; Poen. 367; 871; 1319; Persa 619; 831; Truc. 664; Cas. II 2, 32; II 6, 35; Cist. I 1, 59; I 1, 109; Ter. And. 385; 685; Phorm. 556; Hec. 109; 316; 467; 654; Adelph. 781.

As regards the different forms of prohibition in classical times, nothing can show more strikingly the difference in feeling between *ne* with the perfect subjunctive and *noli* with the infinitive than a comparison of the classes of verbs found in the two constructions. Of the 123 instances of *noli* in Cicero, 76 of them are used with verbs indicating some mental action, or some action which would be as unlikely to be accompanied by emotion on the part of the speaker, e. g. 'Do not suppose,' 'Do not be afraid,' etc.¹ In the Letters, 21 out of the 32 instances are verbs of this sort. Of the 30 instances of *cave* with the subjunctive, 17 are of this sort.² In the Letters the proportion is 11 out of 18. A glance at the instances above cited of *ne* with the present subjunctive will show that most of the verbs in this construction also belong to the same class. We found the same state of things also in Plautus and Terence. Now, side by side with these facts put the fact that in the whole history of the Latin language, from the earliest times down to and including Livy, there are to be found in prohibitions expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive only two, or at most three, verbs denoting mere mental activity, viz. *ne dubitaris* (Cic. ad Att. 7, 3, 2), *ne metueritis* (de rep. 1, 19, 32), *ne*

¹ Planc. 18, 44; 19, 46; 19, 47; 20, 50; 21, 51; 22, 52; 22, 53; Balb. 28, 64; Pis. 20, 46; 27, 66; Marcel. 8, 25; Ligar. 11, 33; 12, 37; Phil. 2, 28, 69; 7, 8, 25; 12, 6, 14; de or. 2, 47, 194; 2, 61, 250; 2, 66, 268; Brut. 33, 125, 40, 148; nat. deor. 2, 18, 47; Cato 22, 79; Rosc. Am. 24, 67; in Caec. div. 12, 39; Verr. 2, 1, 16, 42; 2, 1, 49, 128 (twice); 2, 2, 11, 29; 2, 2, 51, 125; 2, 3, 5, 11; 2, 3, 46, 109; 2, 4, 5, 10; 2, 4, 51, 113 (twice); 2, 5, 5, 10; 2, 5, 18, 45; 2, 5, 53, 139; de re pub. 1, 41, 65; 2, 3, 7; Orat. prid. quam in exsil. iret 1, 1; Tusc. disp. 5, 5, 14; imp. Pomp. 23, 68; agr. 2, 6, 16; 2, 28, 77; Mur. 19, 38; 37, 80; Flacc. 20, 48; 42, 105; Sull. 16, 47 (twice); 27, 76; de dom. 57, 146; de harusp. responso 28, 62; ad Att. 1, 4, 3; 2, 1, 5; 5, 2, 3; 6, 1, 3; 6, 1, 8; 8, 12, 13; 9, 7, 5; 12, 9; 13, 29, 2; 15, 6, 2; 16, 15; ad Brut. 1, 13, 2; ad fam. 4, 4, 3; 4, 5, 5; 5, 21, 1; 7, 25, 1; 12, 16, 1; 12, 33; ad Quint. 1, 2, 4, 14; 3, 6, 7 (twice).

² Ligar. 5, 14; 5, 16 (twice); de rep. 1, 42, 65; de leg. 2, 3, 7; Tusc. disp. 5, 7, 19; ad Att. 5, 21, 5; 7, 20, 1; 8, 15, A 2; 9, 9, 4; 9, 19, 1; 10, 13, 1; ad Brut. 1, 15, 1 (twice); ad fam. 7, 6; 7, 25, 2; 9, 24, 4.

curaris (ad Att. 4, 15, 6).¹ The only other verbs (four or five in number) dealing with mental action distinctly involve also other sorts of action. These are *ne sis aspernatus* (ad Quint. fratrem 2, 10, 5), *ne asciveris neve fueris* adsensus (Ac. 2, 40, 125), *commotus ne sis* (pro Mur. 31, 65), and *ne repudiaris* (ad Att. 2, 5, 1). There are not so many objections to regarding *nec existimaveris* in Livy 21, 43, 11 as a prohibition as there would be in Ciceronian Latin, though it is extremely doubtful even here. In any case, nothing of the sort should cause surprise in Livy, as he marks the beginning of a general breaking up of the strict canons observed in the best period. Livy (3, 2, 9) even goes so far as to say *ne timeate*, which, in prose, would have shocked the nerves of Cicero beyond expression. The almost entire avoidance, until after the Augustan period, of this whole class of verbs expressing mere mental activity in prohibitions expressed by *ne* with the perfect subjunctive, and its remarkable frequency in other forms of prohibitions, can, it seems to me, be explained only in one way. Verbs of this class are, from their very nature, such as would not often be accompanied with passionate feeling, and so are confined to the milder forms of expression. And this, it seems to me, goes far to establish my contention that *ne* with the perfect subjunctive is reserved for prohibitions that are prompted by uncontrollable emotion, or else that are intended to be as vigorous as possible in tone, either, as is generally the case, from some serious motive, or merely as a bit of familiar pleasantry. This tone is commonly one of commanding. Rarely it is one of earnest entreaty, though in such cases the prohibition is commonly introduced by *noli*. *Noli* with the infinitive is the expression best calculated to win the good-will of the hearer, as it merely appeals to him to exercise his own will (i. e. 'Be unwilling'), or to forbear using it; while *ne* with the perfect subjunctive disregards altogether the will of the person addressed, and insists that the will of the speaker be obeyed.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

H. C. ELMER.

¹*Ne necesse habueris reddere* (ad Att. 16, 2, 5) is but poorly supported by manuscript evidence. Even if the reading is correct, as seems highly probable, the idea of *reddere* may be said to figure quite as prominently in the prohibition as that of *habueris*. Such expressions as *ne vos quidem timueritis* (Cic. Tusc. Disp. 1, 41, 98), *numquam putaveris* (Sall. Jug. 110, 4) and *nec putaveris* (Cic. Acad. 2, 46, 141) represent very different uses, as I shall show in Part II of my paper.

II.—THE DOG IN THE RIG-VEDA.

In one of his ingenious if extravagant articles, Brunnhofer, writing to prove that the Rig-Veda was composed before the Aryans entered India, lays stress on the fact that the family-name of one of the Vedic seers means 'dog'; whence, as our author concludes, the poet must have been a 'dog-revering Iranian.'¹

This statement surely implies that there is something unusual in finding 'dog' as a man's name in the Rig-Veda, and shows that the author thinks the dog to have been despised in the Vedic period. But, in point of fact, in the Rig-Veda we find 'Dog's Tail' as a proper name, and in the Brahmanic period we learn that a good Brahman gave this canine name in three different forms to his three sons, so that Çunaḥpuccha, Çunaḥçepa and Çunolāngula (Ait. Br. vii. 15) all rise as witnesses against Brunnhofer; while later still, withal in the most Brahmanic period, we find Dog's Ear, Çunaskarṇa, handed down as a respectable name. Āçvalāyana's teacher was a Çaunaka. Even were the animal despised, the name, then, was unobjectionable; as actually happens in the parallel case of the jackal, which is found as a proper name, although the beast was contemptible. Brunnhofer, to be sure, relegates all jackal-names, for the same reason, to the Turanians; but this is rather absurd, in view of the fact that as late as the grammatical period we have a scholar called Jackal-son. Like Çunaka, Çaunaka, we find Kroṣṭuka, Krāuṣṭuki, both the name and the patronymic (*kroṣṭar*, common and proper name), and both good Hindu names.

But it is to the implication that the dog was a despicable beast in the eyes of the Vedic Aryans that the strongest exception may

¹ Iran und Turan, p. 152: "Als Sohn eines vom Hunde benannten Mannes (Çunaka) kann der Stammvater des Verfasses des II. Maṇḍala nur als Iranier aufgefasst werden, weil . . . der Hund bei den brahmanischen Sanskrit-Ariern ein verachtetes Thier war, nach welchem sich Niemand benannt haben würde." Compare also ib., p. 165: "Çunaka . . . ein Name, der schlechterdings, bei der grossen Verachtung des Hundes unter den Brahmanen, nur ein hundeverehrender Iranier tragen konnte."

be taken; for the contrary point is proved by appeal to the Rig-Veda itself. Schrader (*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, p. 383) says scarcely anything in regard to the position of the dog among the Vedic people. On investigating the matter we learn that in the Rig-Veda the dog is the companion and ally of man; the protector and probably the inmate of his house; a friend so near that he pokes his too familiar head into the dish, and has to be struck aside as a selfish creature. He may have been employed as a steed—the chariot of the Maruts is pictured as one drawn by dogs; but he is, at any rate, used for hunting, and the gift of a kennel of one hundred dogs is gratefully acknowledged. He is never spoken of with scorn, and is deprecated only when he barks or offends by too great eagerness—and then the prayer against him implies familiarity rather than contempt. Once a poet complains that in his need he was forced to eat dog's flesh (entrails), but it may have been sorrow for the dog that prompts his plaint; or, if Brunnhofer would argue that the poet thereby shows contempt, it may be replied that it is cooked dog's entrails to which the poet objects, not the live dog. The dogs of Yama are for him protectors. Saramā is the *devaṇunī*, the gods' dog, and Rudra goes accompanied with dogs (AV.). Whatever the mysterious verse means which declares that 'the goat addressed the dog as (the R̥bhus') awakener,' it is evident that it contains no malignant hit at the canine race. Here is a lullaby from the Rig-Veda which shows on how familiar a footing stood the dog:

Sleep the mother, sleep the father,
Sleep the dog and sleep the master,
Sleep may all the blood-relations,
Sleep the people round about!¹

¹ As ally of man compare RV. ii. 39. 4: "like two dogs guard our bodies" (Yama's dogs in x. 14. 10-11). In ix. 101. 1, 13 the long-tongued selfish dog is driven from the dish. The hunting dog is called 'boar-desiring' (*varāhayās*, x. 86. 4; compare *ṣvāvarāhikā*). For the dog as motive-power compare *śūneṣṭa* in viii. 46. 28 (doubtful) with *ṣvāṣva*. Barking dogs may reasonably be objected to as inimical (i. 182. 4), without contempt. As a gift compare Vāl. 7. 3; as a proper name, i. 24. 12, 13; v. 2. 7. The lullaby or charm is found in RV. vii. 55. 5; AV. iv. 5. 6; the allusion to eating dog, in iv. 18. 13; the capric passage, i. 161. 13. As an evil spirit, along with other howlers of the forest, owl-ghosts and dog-ghosts are known (*ṣvadyātu*, vii. 104. 20, 22). In AV. compare also vi. 37. 3; xi. 2. 2; iv. 36. 6; xi. 2. 30. In Chānd. Up. i. 12 dogs sing a hymn!

It is surely an old legend that is worked up into the spiritual trial of the great king in the epic. After a glorious reign the monarch mounts to heaven with his brothers, his wife and a dog. The way is long, and one by one his human companions fall, but the dog, faithful to the end, accompanies the king to the entrance of heaven. The god appears: "Enter, O king." "But not without this faithful dog," replies the king. The god: "Desert the dog; there is no lack of mercy in doing so." The king: "*Noblesse oblige*,¹ I will either not share in your heavenly world or share it with this faithful attendant." The god: "There is no place in heaven for men with dogs." The king: "To desert a faithful friend is as great a sin as to slay a priest." Here we have the later idea of the ceremonial impurity attaching to the dog united with the epic freedom of regarding the dog as a friend; but perhaps this episode of the dog was imported from Iran!

The horse-sacrifice is ejected from India by Brunnhofer in the same summary way as, on the grounds explained above, he throws out the second book of the Rig-Veda. In the volume already referred to (p. 160) the author declares that the horse-sacrifice can have arisen only "in a land rich in horses," and hence, if we desire to find the country where the horse-sacrifice began and was developed "werden wir nirgends anders als nach Iran hinblicken dürfen." It is here assumed that India in the Vedic period was not rich in horses, and Brunnhofer adds that in consequence of the hot, damp climate, India was never distinguished for its steeds. The latter remark may be correct (although the Rig-Veda itself speaks of the Indus as *svācīvā surāthā* 'having excellent horses and chariots,' x. 75. 8), but the statement that the Vedic horse-sacrifice requires a land where horses are numerous is not necessarily true, and the deduction that India was not rich in horses depends on the *a priori* assumption that India was not the land of the Vedic poets. For the Vedic poets extol the horse-sacrifice, and horses and horse-races are sprinkled over every page of the Rig-Veda. With what right, then, can it be assumed that the poets and their horses were not in India? Do not the epic heroes also have horse-races? The notion that India is not a land rich in horses emanates from Roth, who should have been cited in connection with this statement. Compare Z. D. M. G. XXXV, p. 686:

¹*Anāryam āryeṇa çakyaṁ kartum duṣkaram etad ārya*, xvii. 3. 9.

"Diese Sitte [horse-racing] kann in beschränkteren Thalebenen sich erhalten wenn sie eingebürgert ist, aber entsprungen ist sie wohl nur in angrenzenden weiten Flächen . . . Anderseits ist jedoch zu merken dass . . . das Ross [in the Rig-Veda] ein selteneres und werthvolles Thier ist, das nicht wie das Rind, zu Hunderten und Tausenden besessen und verschenkt wird, sondern in einzelnen Paaren oder wenigstens in mässiger Zahl."

On the contrary, in the Rig-Veda the horse is not rare (although he is valuable); he is, exactly like kine, owned and given by hundreds and by thousands. In Rig-Veda v. 33. 8 a gift of ten horses is recorded; in ib. vi. 47. 22-24, one of ten horses and ten chariots. Purupanthās gave one poet, according to his own acknowledgment, "hundreds, thousands of horses" (vi. 63. 10), and in the eighth book (Persian?) gifts of three hundred and of sixty thousand horses respectively are received (viii. 6. 47; 46. 22). In the passage cited above (Vāl. 7. 3), where is acknowledged the gift of one hundred dogs, the recipient acknowledges also the gift of four hundred mares. These passages may be late additions to old hymns—although Brunnhofer, who erects so much on a *dānastuti* basis, would probably not claim this—but they are, at any rate, as authentic as are the statements in regard to gifts of cattle, and unless hundreds or thousands be a 'mässige Zahl,' it will be necessary to take quite a different view on this subject than that of Roth. Wherever horse-raising began, there is no evidence whatever that India was not from the earliest times devoted to the horse or lacked a supply, even if it was not customary to have so large a herd of horses as of cattle. Certainly there is in the Rig-Veda no ground for this argument advanced by Brunnhofer in regard to the literature on the horse-sacrifice.

Brunnhofer's hobby, to the elucidation of which he has now devoted three volumes, is the idea that the Rig-Veda was written on the south or east side of the Caspian Sea, and not in India. To support this hypothesis he has brought forward a number of interesting geographical facts and some Vedic names which, as he thinks, show Turanian or Iranian origin. But besides this argument of names—many of which are of doubtful connection with the foreign names adduced as related, while some are probably no more indicative of geographical situation than are European names in America—there occurs in our author's writings every now and then an argument that is of more conse-

quence. It has been shown how, in the little matter of dogs and horses, there is not found the accuracy which would be desirable, considering how important is the use made of the asserted facts. Still more deplorable is it to find employed an argument which may be put symbolically thus: 'Since χ is Iranian, it cannot be Indian; hence, being found in the Veda, the Veda is Iranian; and if Iranian, it must have arisen near the Caspian Sea'—and then to discover that, after all, χ is Indian. For example, the contemplative theosophy shown in the Varuna hymns is said to be not natural to India: it must be Iranian; and then follows: "Wenn wir uns aber im gesammten Iran nach einer Landschaft umsehen wo die tropische Ueberfülle der gütigen Natur ein solches Hinbrüten über die den Augen und Ohren sich aufdrängenden Räthsel des Daseins ermöglichte, so bleibt uns keine andere Wahl als dieselbe am Südrande des Kaspischen Meeres zu suchen" (ib., p. 176). What nonsense! To maintain that a people so essentially theosophic and philosophic as the Indian could not have thought out a god like Varuna is the emptiest assumption, and on that assumption hangs the whole argument.

This from the first volume, *Iran und Turan*.

In Brunnhofer's second volume, *Vom Pontus bis zum Indus* (1890), there is an interesting argument which, illustrating at once the learned author's method and the verisimilitude of his important discoveries, deserves to be cited almost entire¹: "Through all the Rig-Veda there constantly recurs the prayer which, e. g., is thus formulated by the Ṛshi Ḡṛtsamada, ii. 33. 2: 'I would reach one hundred winters by means of thy best medicines,' or by Vasiṣṭha, vii. 101. 6: 'May my sacrifice preserve (me) to the age of one hundred autumns.' Even in the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā, xiii. 41, and in Aitareya-Brahmaṇa, vi. 2, one hundred years are named as the highest age of life (v. Weber, Ind. St. I 313, note). The reckoning of time according to hundred winters or autumns can have arisen only in a rough mountain-district of Iran; and, too, the age of one hundred years that at first seems fantastic (in which, however, there was once doubtless some truth) can be explained only from the conserving power of the pure mountain air of a highland country." Then Armenia is shown to be a place where the age of one hundred years can be reached, and the reader is left to draw the

¹ With the omission of the Sanskrit text (loc. cit., p. 97).

inevitable conclusion that the whole of the Rig-Veda, which contains such prayers as those cited above, could have been composed only in Iran.

In regard to which is to be noted—First, that the use of 'autumn' may be a form handed down from a time centuries before the literature, in which is found the formula, was composed, even as the formula is still preserved centuries after the Rig-Veda collection was completed; for the regular epic benediction is *jīva śaradaḥ śatam* 'live one hundred autumns.' Again, the Vedic type for a year is less winter than autumn, while in the Rig-Veda summer also occurs as the equivalent of year. Compare vii. 66. 11: "who established the autumn,¹ the month and the day"; and the use of summer in iv. 57. 7; x. 85. 5; 124. 4; also the stock phrase *śatā-śārādāya*. No word for old meaning 'possessed of winters' occurs in a form parallel to *śarādvān* 'possessed of autumns.' Moreover, autumn is naturally the type of the year, and winter scarcely less so, even in India, for these are the only seasons when life is worth living; spring is debilitating and summer is unendurable.

Secondly, in regard to the use of one hundred, if wishes implied facts India is just where it is allowable to predicate one hundred years as a probable age for man to live, for in the Rig-Veda no more than in later times this length of time, or more, is the wish expressed. In Mandelslo we read that the proper formula is "may one live seven hundred years," and as this is A. D. 1638, it will scarcely be thought even by Brunnhofer that the wisher lived in Armenia's mountains. In the same work it is stated that the Hindus regard one hundred years as the limit of mortal life. To revert to the Upanishads, we have in the Chāndogya the historical statement that Mahidāsa lived 116 years.² Compare Ait. Ār. ii. 2. 1. 1, where it is assumed that one hundred years is the limit. Historical examples are not lacking to show that in our own time men have reached that age in India (and America) without resorting to mountain-tops. Finally, one hundred in the Rig-Veda generally means not 100, but 'many'; compare *śatā-kṛatu*, *śatāmūti*, *śatāvāja*; although *daśamī*, the tenth of ten-

¹ Harvest. Compare for one hundred years as norm in the earlier period Çat. Br. v. 4. 1. 13, etc.; but no more so here than later, Manu, i. 83, and Kauṣīt. Upan. ii. 11.

² Chānd. Up. iii. 16. 7: (Mahidāsa Aitareya) *sa ha śoḍaśam varṣaśatam ajīvat*.

year periods, shows that hundred may here be taken literally. But in most cases it is a mere wish that is uttered.

Therefore, whether we take one hundred as a fact or, as it should be taken, as a wish, the argument based on the number is worthless. It is not necessary to go to Iran to find the place where "may we live one hundred winters (or autumns)" must have first been formulated. All that is true in Brunnhofer's contention is, that a consistent use of winter as the type of year would point to a northern abode. But we see that in the Rig-Veda 'autumn' is also employed for year, and that this formula lasts for centuries. Hence it may have been used for centuries before the literature began; and so, too, may 'winter' have been used in just such an expression, and that formula may have been stereotyped and preserved for generations. Analogy would show this to have been the case.

But Brunnhofer has given us even a better bit of philologic logic. In his last volume, *Vom Aral bis zur Gangā* (1892), he endeavors to prove that the king mentioned in the following verse was a Parthian monarch who lived in the plains about Merw: "These [previously recounted] are the gifts of *Prthu-çravas Kānita*, the one who gives richly. He has given a golden car; he was a generous prince; he has got the widest glory." 'Widest glory' is a play on *Prthu-çravas*, i. e. 'he of broad fame,' an appellation exactly like that in *prthuyāman* 'she of broad paths' (Dawn), and other Vedic adjectives. But Brunnhofer's argument is as follows (p. 145): Instead of meaning 'he of broad fame,' *Prthu-çravas* *might be* 'the fame of the Parthians.' This king called Fame-of-the-Parthians lived near the Caspian Sea; for the conditions under which the hymn is written require a great plain, and there is such a plain about Merw. The necessity for this plain is apparent, because an extended system of canals under a Parthian king requires a great plain. The system of canals is implied by the sobriquet *Kānita*. This name is a patronymic from *kanita*, usually interpreted as 'son of a maiden,' but this is impossible (compare *παρθένιος*, *παρθενίας*, *Παρθενοναίος*?), for instead of being Sanskrit (Vedic), it might be a foreign Iranian word, and then its Vedic form would be, if we assume a change of ending, *khanītar* for *kanita*; and if we explain *khanītar* from *khan* 'to dig,' as meaning a 'digger of canals,' we have the proof desired!

That is to say, assuming that *Prthu-çravas* does not mean what

it apparently does; and assuming that *kanita* must be Iranian, and that if Iranian it stands for *khanitar*; and that, if it is *khanitar* = 'digger,' this 'digger' must be a canal-digger; then the assumption that this assumed 'digger of canals' is a Parthian necessitates us to believe that the assumed king called 'Fame of the Parthians' lived near the Oxus, because there is a plain there where an 'extended system of canals' is practicable!

It is scarcely necessary to point out in addition that another assumption is not proved, viz. that this tag to an earlier hymn¹ is itself early; or that the sole proof offered that 'digger' must be canal-digger—viz. because *khanitrima* '(water) in a ditch' might be by another assumption rendered 'canal-water'—is not sufficient evidence. In a word, there is as much presumption as assumption in the whole proof.

What is the implied principle that underlies so much of Brunnhofer's speculation? It is that similarity, when found between the customs or ideas of two peoples, signifies that these customs or ideas could not have been produced independently. We have seen this especially prominent in his interpretation of loftier Hindu religious thought, which is relegated to the Persians, or their ancestors, because it corresponds with an Iranian mood of mind.

But turning from Brunnhofer's works, let us now examine the general theory of probabilities on which rest so many comparable arguments for primitive association in law, custom and religion. Does it follow that because there is likeness in any regard between the laws, customs and religious beliefs of two members of the Aryan group, that therefore these laws, customs or religious beliefs must be referred to a common origin, or that one of the groups must have borrowed from the other?

As 'Indo-European' are cited, in view of what we know from India, Greece and Germany (Tacitus), the virtue of hospitality, the vice of desperate gaming, and other international traits. The common naming of stars (Ursa Major) as 'Bear' has also been emphasized. In Williams' Key, cited in Palfrey's History of New England, vol. I, p. 36, note, we read that the North American Indians whose habitat was Massachusetts gave the Ursa Major "their own name for the bear." And in the same work, p. 32, speaking of the traits of these Indians as recorded by

¹ RV. viii. 46. 24.

those that first knew them, the author notes as peculiarly characteristic of the Indian that "he was a desperate gambler"; while on p. 37 his great virtue is recorded as being "hospitality."¹

In Tacitus' *Germania*, concerning the chiefs and captains there is a passage which, when compared with what is said of other Aryans, should also be set beside this note in regard to the American Indians: "The sachem was not necessarily the captain. Command fell to him who was recognized as the most capable and experienced warrior" (*ib.*, p. 39). Compare *reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt*, etc. (7).

In religion, even in the minutiae of religious hocuspocus, there is no certainty that agreement betokens inheritance. In the *Rig-Veda* seven is a mystic number, and its sanctity is trebled by the use of 3×7 . But not only seven, even this mystic 3×7 is a current religious number among the Mexicans.²

Worthless are many comparisons of like gods, and for the same reason. In this regard sins Ehni, who, on p. 196 of *Der vedische Mythos des Yama*, begins a "Comparison of the Indian (Hindu) Yama-myth with analogous sagas of Hellenic mythology" with the words "*Der hellenische Volksstamm . . . hat das ur-arische Erbgut . . . treu bewahrt*," and continuing, says: "*Die Identität des Namens [Yamas] . . . ist nur in einer mehr oder weniger genauen Uebersetzung (Dionysos, Rhadamanthys) bewahrt worden, oder auch ganz verloren gegangen, aber die eigenthümlichen Ideen . . . finden wir bei den Hellenen.*" Thence the author goes on to find the Yama-myth in various Grecian forms, on the slender basis of similar ideas and their development in India and Hellas. Then turning to the eternal Tacitus, he finds in *Tuisco-Mannus* the exact parallel to Yama-Manu; while the cosmogony of the *Edda* helps him to refer the birds of Ymir (= Yama) from the bright and dark heavens (of the Hindu) (= Muspelheim and Niflheim) to the remotest period of Indo-

¹ That this criticism is not directed against a man of straw may be seen by comparing p. 5 of Holtzmann's essay *Ueber das alte indische Epos*: "*Das Mahabharata (ist) oft der beste Commentar zur Germania.*" As examples to illustrate Tacitus are given from the Hindu epic 'desperate gambling, faithfulness of followers, blood-revenge, paradise as a reward for dying on the field of battle'; and these similarities between German and Hindu "permit us to assume a great antiquity for the germ of the Hindu epic." Every one of these traits belongs to the American Indians!

² The writer owes this last statement to verbal information given to him by Dr. Brinton.

European unity; nor does he hesitate, advancing consistently on the same lines, to identify the origin of man from parts of Ymir with that theologic parable which is set down in one of the latest hymns of the Rig-Veda, where men are produced from members of the Universal Person.

The moral to be drawn from this is applicable above all in the case of comparative law. Without taking this into consideration, Leist¹ has ventured upon a comparison of Graeco-Italian laws with those of India, claiming, because of similarity, a mutual origin for many practices, some of which have been picked out of law-books in India which are of so recent a date that their statutes should not be compared with any alien laws. And as a result he has erected quite a code, comprising what he calls by a misnomer *jus gentium*, of which it is safe to say not a quarter is primitive law.²

No law, custom, or religious belief of one country can, merely because it is like that of another country, therefore be assumed to be borrowed, or to have come from the same source. This is a principle which should be emphasized until it be followed in all comparative investigation on the Aryan group.

EDWARD WASHBURN HOPKINS.

¹ Alt-arisches Jus Gentium, and Graeco-italische Rechtsgeschichte.

² On p. 605 of the Jus Gentium, Leist speaks of the "institutions, customs, formulae and thoughts (of India), which coincide so remarkably with Greek and Roman sources and often are so marked by the same Aryan words that I hold as certain the Indo-Graeco-Italian connection." The correspondence of words is not so frequent, and when it fails, that of ideas is not enough to prove the point.

III.—ON THE ARCHAISMS NOTED BY SERVIUS IN THE COMMENTARY TO VERGIL.¹

In the *Aeneid*, Vergil writes of men whose customs were, in many respects, different from those of the men of his own times. To picture the early times accurately, it was necessary to give to his work an antique cast and, in questions religious, to retain in his own language some expressions that were archaic. An old word in the poem would be as forcible a reminder of the early days of the Romans as would be the most elaborate description set forth in the polished language of the court of Augustus.

¹ BIBLIOGRAPHY.

For Servius the edition of Thilo-Hagen, Leipsic, 1878-87, has been used, though three comments have been given from the edition of Lion. The following works have been found of service in the preparation of this paper:

- Corssen: *Ueber Aussprache, Vocalismus und Betonung der lat. Sprache*². Leip., 1866-70.
- Draeger: *Historische Syn. der lat. Sprache*³. Leip., 1878-81.
- Krebs (Allgayer-Schmalz): *Antibarbarus*⁶. Basel, 1886-88.
- Mueller: *Handbuch der klass. Altertumswissenschaft*, II². 1889-90.
- Neue: *Formenlehre der lat. Sprache*, I², II² (verbs), II³ (adj., adv., pron., etc.).
- Reisig-Haase (Hagen, Heerdegen, Schmalz, Landgraf): *Vorlesungen über lat. Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin, 1888-90.
- Seelmann: *Aussprache des Lateins*. Heilbronn, 1885.
- Thomas: *Essai sur Servius*. Paris, 1880.
- Westphal: *Die Verbal-flexion d. lat. Sprache*. Jena, 1873.
- Wölfflin: *Archiv für lat. Lex. u. Gram.* 1884-93.
- Wordsworth: *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin*. Oxford, 1874.
- Altenburg, F. W.: *De usu antiquae locutionis in Lucr. carmine*. 1857.
- Antoine: *De casuum syntaxi Vergiliana*. Paris, 1882.
- Badstübner: *De Sall. dicendi genere commentatio*. 1863.
- Bouterwek: *Lucr. Quaestiones*. 1861.
- Constans: *De Sermone Sallustiano*. Paris, 1880.
- Duderstadt: *De partic. usu ap. Catull.* Halle, 1881.
- Engelbrecht: *Studia Terentiana*. Vind., 1883.
- Holtze, F. W.: *Syntaxis Lucr. Lineamenta*. Leip., 1868.
- Jahnsson: *De verbis Lat. deponentibus*. 1872.
- Keller: *De verb. cum praep. comp. ap. Lucr. usu*. Halle, 1880.
- Kuehn: *Quaestiones Lucr.* 1869.

With this in mind, we are not surprised at the words of Quintilian (1, 7, 18): Vergilius amantissimus vetustatis, and (9, 3, 14): alia commendatio vetustatis, cuius amator unice Vergilius fuit. The reason for this striving after the antique is given (8, 3, 24): propriis dignitatem dat antiquitas . . . quibus non quilibet fuerit usus, eoque ornamento acerrimi iudicii P. Vergilius unice est usus. A similar opinion is expressed by Seneca (ap. Aul. Gell. 12, 2, 10): Vergilius quoque noster non ex alia causa duos quosdam versus et enormes et aliquid supra mensuram trahentis interposuit quam ut Ennianus populus adgnosceret in novo carmine aliquid antiquitatis. As this striving for the antique flavor was so marked, it furnished a good field for investigation to the Roman critics. Quintilian (9, 3) cites many examples; Macrobius, book VI, discusses this element quite fully; but the work of Servius is the most important of the commentaries that have come down to us. Notwithstanding the importance of his work, there is much uncertainty in reference to his name, his date, and the comments that can with certainty be ascribed to him. For the purposes of the present paper it is enough to know that they may be assigned to the latter half of the fourth century A. D. If the entire work was written about that time, we have the views of a critic who judged of the work of Vergil in the light of the changes of four hundred years. But we are left in uncertainty as to the date of some of the comments, for there are two versions of the Commentary, the shorter 'Servius,' and the longer, the so-called 'Scholia of Daniel.' There is considerable difference between the two versions, and it will be necessary to compare them with reference to the form of statement and their relative value so far as they treat of the archaisms of Vergil.

Moore: Servius on the Tropes and Figures of Vergil. Baltimore, 1891.

Müller, L.: Q. Ennius. St. Petersburg, 1884.

Mustard: Etymologies in the Servian Commentary to Vergil. 1892.

Overhaltheus: Syntaxis Catulliana capita duo. 1875.

Prohl: De formis ant. Lucretianis. Bres., 1859.

Riemann: Langue et Grammaire de Tite-Live. Paris, 1885.

Schneemann: De verb. praep. comp. ap. Cat., Tib., Prop. structura. Halle, 1881.

Schultze: De archaismis Sallustianis. Halle, 1871.

Slaughter: The Substantives of Terence. Boston, 1891.

Smith, K. W.: Archaisms of Terence mentioned in the Com. of Donatus. Baltimore, 1890.

Other works are referred to by their titles in the paper.

In this paper are given references to 278 comments in which the Commentary has called attention to the archaic character of the words of Vergil. To 14 of these no special designation has been attached, e. g. 1, 295¹ clam et post quae ante communes fuerunt: nunc in his mutata natura est. The remaining 264 are referred to in 18 different ways. For convenience they may be divided into four classes: archaisms so called by the commentator, and those in which he has used the words *antiqui*, *veteres*, *maiores*, or some form of these words. The following table shows the number of times each of these terms is used:

	Archaisms.	Antiqui.	Veteres.	Maiores.	Undesignated.	Total.
Servius,	11	64	1	17	14	107
Schol. Dan.	3—1 ²	51—1 ²	113—1 ²	1	0	168—3 ²
	14—1 ²	115—1 ²	114—1 ²	18	14	275—3 ²

Excluding the comments in which the word *antiqui* is used, there is a very clear line of demarcation between the two versions, as the Schol. Dan. does not use the word *maiores*, excepting once in the form *m. nostri* (6, 1, s. v. *calas*), and the Servius uses the word *veteres* in only one comment where some other word designating time is not used with it in the same comment. 1, 139 inmania aspera; manum enim antiqui bonum dicebant; cf. 2, 268 manum vero, unde est mane, bonum dixere veteres. This, according to the critical apparatus of Thilo-Hagen, is the reading of the MSS *om.* CME, and it may not have belonged to the original Servius. This same difference of expression is found also in the comments referring to the early customs of the Romans. In 130 of these comments, 71 are from the Servius (45 *maiores*, 19 *antiqui*, 7 *veteres*, but in two of the latter *ap. vet.* has been inserted, 12, 395, 606), 59 are from the Schol. Dan. (5 undesignated, 17 *antiqui*, 37 *vet.*).

In 5 comments—bipenni (2, 479), aspiration (6, 4), moerorum (10, 24), fraus (11, 708)—the Servius uses the word *veteres* with another word indicating time. There are 4—cernere (12, 709), peculi (B. 1, 32), cuius (B. 3, 1), medicor (G. 1, 193)—in which two terms are used in the same comment, but of this there are no examples in the Schol. Dan. The Servius repeats 5 comments using the same general statement and the same words referring to the archaism under discussion. In 4 comments different words

¹ The Aeneid is referred to by book and line only.

² Omitted by Thilo-Hagen; in Lion's edition.

are used. In the Schol. Dan., 12 comments are repeated with the same words, and 9 with different words. In 6 instances the two versions have different comments on the same word, and in 60 comments the Schol. Dan. has added, with more or less appropriateness, to the statement in the Servius. These figures do not show any special difference between the versions in reference to the repetition of comments, but there is a marked difference seen when we compare their separate comments on the same words.

In many comments the Schol. Dan. calls attention to an archaism not mentioned in the Servius. 1, 30 *Achilli propter ὁμοιοτέλευτον* detraxit 's' litteram; 2, 6 *vetus genetivus*, and 3, 87 *veteres Achilli declinabant*. G. 3, 190 the Servius reads: *aetatem generaliter dicimus pro anno et pro triginta et pro centum et pro quovis tempore*. In the Schol. Dan. 1, 283 *iuxta veteres aetas hic pro tempore posita est*. In these the Schol. Dan. has simply added the statement that the word with a certain meaning was used by the *veteres*. This applies equally well to all the list, and for that reason only the words, their meanings, and the references will be given, following the order in which the same parts of speech are to be given in this paper. *aevum* (*aetas perpetua*) 6, 763; 7, 776; *ars* (*dolus*) 2, 15; 7, 477; 11, 760: 1, 657; *axis* (*septentrio*) 2, 512; G. 2, 271: G. 3, 351; *flumen* (*fluor*) 1, 465: 12, 517; *hiems* (*tempus*) 1, 122; 2, 110: 1, 125; 5, 11; *interpres* 3, 359; 10, 175: 4, 608; *opes* (*auxilium*) 1, 601; 9, 529; 11, 532: 8, 171 (*milites*); *veniam* (*beneficium*) 1, 519; 3, 144; 4, 50; 10, 903: 4, 435; 11, 101; *via* (*ratio*) 3, 395; G. 2, 22: 4, 477; *quicquid erit* 5, 710: 2, 77 (*mors*); *honestus* (*pulcher*) 10, 133; G. 2, 392: 1, 289; *caeruleus* (*niger*) 5, 123; 7, 198; 8, 1: 3, 64; *indignus* 6, 163; 9, 592; B. 10, 10: 4, 617; B. 8, 18; *malignus* (*exiguus, obscurus*) 6, 270; 11, 525: G. 2, 179; *fervere* 4, 409: 8, 677; *flectere* 5, 28: 9, 603; *hausit* 1, 738: 4, 359; *id metuens* 1, 61: 1, 23; *ilicet* 6, 216, 231: 2, 424; *piare* 2, 140; 6, 379: 1, 378; *sperare* 4, 419; B. 8, 26: 1, 543; *stridere* G. 4, 556: 2, 418; *stringere* 5, 163; 9, 292, 572: 8, 63; 10, 478; *subire* 7, 161: 4, 598; *ululare* 6, 257: 4, 168; 11, 662. 5, 862 *currit iter ut Cicero ite viam, redite viam*. 4, 468 *ire viam veteri more iuxta ius, ut ite viam, redite viam, et alibi primus et ire viam*. In many of these comments the Schol. Dan. gives a quotation from an early poet, and thus shows that the word was in fact used by the *veteres*, though this must not be interpreted to mean that the

expression was not also used by the writers of a later period. The statement in the Servius would leave this to be inferred from its silence in reference to any author in which the expression was to be found.

Somewhat similar to these are the 60 comments in which the Schol. Dan. has added to the comment made by the Servius. In most of them the Servius gives a general statement in reference to a certain passage, and the Schol. Dan. has added a comment upon a single word. A single quotation will sufficiently illustrate this: 4, 130 iubare exorto nato lucifero: nam proprie iubar lucifer dicitur, quod iubas lucis effundit: unde iam quicquid splendet iubar dicitur, ut argenti, gemmarum est autem lucifer interdum Iovis: *nam et antiqui iubar quasi iuvar dicebant.* The following are the short comments where the Servius expressly speaks of an expression which the Schol. Dan. declares archaic: 1, 211 tergora tergus tergoris . . . corium significat, tergum . . . dorsum significat, *sed haec a veteribus confundebantur, ut alibi taurino quantum possent circumdare tergo. item in nono ingerit hastas in tergus.* Cf. 1, 368 tergo pro terгоре. 9, 410 tergum pro tergus dixit. 9, 664 flictu pro inflictu, *vel inflictu*, id est ictu: nam detraxit more suo praepositionem. *et loquutus est iuxta antiquum morem. Pacuvius Teucro flictus navium.* 2, 140 effugia et fuga dicimus et effugium . . . *nam hostia quae ad aras adducta est immolanda, si casu effugeret, effugia vocari veteri more solet.* 1, 315 habitum vultum et amictum. *habitus apud veteres dicebatur tam corporis quam eorum quae praeter corpus sunt.* 1, 123 imbrem imber dicitur umor omnis, ut Lucr. ex igni atque anima nascuntur et imbri, id est umore. *veteres enim omnem aquam imbrem dicebant. Ennius imbrem pro aqua marina ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni.* Cf. the use of the Greek word $\delta\mu\beta\rho\varsigma$. Munro ad Lucr. 1, 715. 8, 632 matrem quasi matrem, cuius adfectum pueris exhibebat. *sane veteres etiam nutrices matres vocabant, ut ait Plautus in Menaechmis et mater non possit dignoscere, quae mammam dabat.* Cf. Non. 423, 23 M. mater aliquando pro nutrice ponitur. 12, 437 inter praemia *inter veteres pro ad ponebant: id est ad praemia.* 4, 116 confieri con abundat . . . *quamvis veteres indifferenter confieri dicebant.* 12, 9 gliscit crescit *veteres incremento ponebant.* See Non. 22, 16; Lucr. 1, 474; Sil. Ital. 14, 308.

There are a few comments in both the versions which do not exactly agree, even though they are from the same writer. In

one comment an archaism is mentioned, but not in others. As examples of this may be mentioned the comments on *dives*, *obex*, *bina* and *tusus*, which will be given with the other comments. From the Schol. Dan. the best examples are the following: 2, 238 *feta nunc plena, ut in bucolicis (1, 49) templantur pabula fetas, alias enixa iam, ut (8, 630) fecerat et viridi fetam.* G. 3, 176 *antiqui enim fetum pro gravido solebant ponere, ut Varro Atacinus feta feris Libye, et ipse Vergilius scandit fatalis machina muros feta armis.* 2, 148 *obliviscere quidam pro contemne vel negligere, ut (5, 703) oblitus fatorum.* (Cf. 4, 221.) II, 866 *obliti nonnulli Vergilium secundum vetustatem hoc verbo usum tradunt, ut obliti ἀμελήσαντες, hoc est negligentes et contemnentes, putent: ... ut (5, 174) oblitus decoris sui et (5, 703) oblitus fatorum.* Cf. 3, 628. These internal variations of the two versions are of little moment, as they are few in number and are not contradictory. But the differences between the two versions themselves show that the writers were looking from an entirely different standpoint, the writer of the Schol. Dan. seeming to keep constantly in view the similarity between Vergil's vocabulary and that of preceding writers. As this was a part of his object, it will be necessary to compare his work especially (though including the Servius also) with the work of some of the other Roman commentators. Mention has already been made of the comments of Quintilian and of Macrobius, both of whom criticised in general terms and not so minutely as Servius.

Two other commentators, Porphyryon and Donatus, have followed the same plan as Servius. From the comments of Porphyryon on the works of Horace but little can be gathered bearing on the question of archaic language. The comments on *lavère* O. 3, 12, 2; 4, 6, 26; Ep. 17, 50; on *dives opum (pro opibus)* S. 2, 3, 142; on *Ety. Figura* O. 3, 29, 50, agree with the comments of Servius on the same expressions. Commenting on *unde* O. 1, 12, 17, he quotes *genus unde Latinum* (Verg. 1, 6), where the Schol. Dan. finds an archaism. The simple verb *cedunt* O. 2, 6, 15; *adoreo* O. 4, 4, 41 (quoted by Schol. Dan. 10, 677), are not called archaic. O. 2, 6, 15 *Graeca figura dictum est illi certat pro cum illo certat.* Servius B. 5, 8 *usurpatum est: nam hodie certo tecum dicimus.* Cf. G. 2, 138. In the following, Servius and Porphyryon do not agree in their comments: P. ad O. 1, 15, 34 *Achillei et Ulixei veteres dixerunt.* Cf. S. ad 1, 30. P. ad O. 2, 1, 1 *non civile sed civicum dixit antiqua figura.* S. ad

6, 772 *civica* debuit dicere, sed mutavit, ut e contra Horatius . . . *civicum* pro *civilem*. O. 3, 4, 29 ut enim veteres non numquam pro locali particula ponebant, ut Vergilius (5, 329). Ep. 1, 16, 31 nomine . . . dici. ἀρχαϊσμός figura. Vergilius (G. 4, 356) et te crudelem nomine dicit. S. 2, 4, 81 mappas antiqui dicebant quae nunc mantelia. Lucilius et velli mappas. Cf. S. ad 1, 701, where he uses both words. A. P. 457 antiqui enim et ructo et ructor dixerunt. S. ad 3, 576 ructo ructas tantum facit. . . . Horatius usurpavit ructatur. These citations show a tendency on the part of Porphyryon to refer to the *veteres* in about the same way as the writer of the Schol. Dan.

Dr. K. W. Smith (Archaisms of Terence mentioned in the Commentary of Donatus, p. 4) calls attention to the fact that Vergil is the author most freely quoted by Donatus for illustrations of archaic usage. As both commentators were working in similar fields and followed the same general line of treatment, it will be in order to compare their statements in reference to the words commented on by Servius. In a few comments Don. calls attention to an archaism not mentioned by Servius. Phor. 3, 2, 37, Don. says ὁμοιοτέλετον usitatum veteribus. Servius calls frequent attention to the fact that Vergil avoids it. Cf. 1, 30; 11, 112; B. 3, 1; G. 3, 539, et al. See Smith, p. 13; Moore, p. 52. Phor. 5, 1, 29 composito: sic veteres, nos ex composito, ut (Verg. 2, 129). Ad. 1, 2, 47 abiero ἀρχαϊσμός, ut (Verg. 2, 719). (Cf. ad Phor. 2, 3, 73.) Ad Phor. 1, 2, 91 nos dicimus dimitte, antiqui . . . amitte (Verg. 2, 148). Ad Eun. 5, 8, 62 numquam pro non, ἀρχαϊσμός, and at Ad. 2, 1, 3; 4, 2, 31; 4, 5, 26; And. 2, 4, 7, Verg. 1, 670 is quoted. Ad Ad. 2, 3, 11 mage pro magis ἀρχαϊσμός. Not mentioned in the long note ad Verg. 10, 481. "Mage is frequent in Plautus, but does not occur in Terence," Smith, p. 25. Ad. 1, 1, 23 quod nos educare dicimus, educere veteres dicebant, ut (Verg. 6, 765). And. 1, 3, 18 obiit mortem: plene dixit, quod nos obiit tantum (Verg. 10, 641). Ad And. 3, 2, 12 temno veteres dicebant sine praepositione. Ad Verg. 1, 665 temnis aphaeresis est pro contemnis. Cf. 1, 542. 5, 21 tendere pro contendere; 1, 203 mittite *pro* omittite. These seem to show that Donatus resorted to the archaistic explanation more frequently than Servius, but, on the other hand, there are 23 comments—17 in the Schol. Dan., 5 in the Servius, and 1 in both—which call attention to an archaism not mentioned by Donatus. Servius 11, 592 pariter similiter uno modo. et est antiquum. G. 1, 189

similiter. antique dixit, ut Plautus in Aulularia pariter moratus, ut pater avusque fuit, hoc est ὁμοίως. This meaning is rare in Cic. Hand Tursell. 4, 389; Reisig-Haase, 3, N. 419 b. Don. Eun. 1, 2, 12 quotes from Sallust, but does not speak of an archaism. Don. Phor. 2, 2, 10 amicus, nominativum pro vocativo posuit. Servius does not decide in similar instances. 1, 451 apud maiores idem erat vocativus et nominativus, ut hic Mercurius et O Mercurius. 1, 734 Bacchus aut antiptosis est, aut antiquus vocativus. Cf. 8, 77; 10, 327; 11, 464; 12, 192. Don. Eun. 2, 1, 13 mentions *insomnia* (singular) without comment: Serv. 4, 9 insomnia enim, licet Pacuvius et Ennius frequenter dixerint, Plinius exclusit et de usu removet. Don. Eun. 2, 3, 12 et alacer et alacris (Verg. 5, 380). Serv. 6, 685 et sciendum antiquos et alacris et alacer . . . dixisse. nunc masculino utrumque damus, de feminino alacer et acer numquam dicimus. The different forms for the masculine and the feminine of adjectives were not always used in Early Latin, and masculine adjectives in *is* occur in Cic., Livy and Tac.; Munro, Lucr. 4, 160; Neue, 2³, 16; Engelbrecht, p. 26. Don. Hec. 5, 3, 13; Ad. 2, 4, 15 etiam particula consentientis. Serv. 11, 373 apud maiores etiam consentientis fuerat, quod tamen in his recentibus non invenitur. However, it is here used by Vergil to emphasize a pronoun in contrast with a preceding one, *nos . . . etiam tu*. Don. And. 3, 3, 11 ne me obseca: pro ne me obsecres. 5, 2, 27 ne saevi tantopere: ne imperativo magis quam conjunctivo adiungitur, ut Vergilius, ne saevi, magna sacerdos. Serv. 6, 544 antique dictum est: nam nunc ne saevias dicimus, nec imperativum iungimus adverbio imperantis. 2, 606; 7, 202; 9, 113, he does not mention it as an archaism, while B. 2, 17 he says 'ne crede' ne confide. *Ne* with the imperative is poetical and characteristic of the *sermo vulgaris* (Handbuch, 2, 409, 37; Reisig-Haase, 3, 506).

The comments in which the Schol. Dan. mentions an archaism not noticed by Donatus are generally short, and the statement is generally based upon a citation from Plautus or Terence. Two comments will show sufficiently clearly the difference between the two commentators. Don. And. 2, 6, 27 ille est huius rei caput: caput est origo et summa unius cuiusque rei, ut Vergilius O Latio caput horum et causa malorum (11, 361). Servius: caput principium et est antiquum. *quia qui auctor et princeps rei gestae fuerat, caput a veteribus dicebatur: Terentius (supra), Plautus in Asinaria (3, 3, 138) ego caput huic fui argento inveniundo.*

See 12, 600. Don. Phor. 1, 2, 73 *confidens* . . . *pro improbo, audaci ac temerario posuit, ut* (And. 5, 3, 5): *O ingentem confidentiam*. Schol. Dan. G. 4, 444 *confidentissime pro audacissime: confidentiam enim veteres pro impudenti audacia dicebant ut Terentius* (supra). In the remaining comments the references will be given to the two commentators, and also an indication in parentheses of the quotations, when they both cite the same passage or when the commentator cites Ter. or Verg. The words on which the comments are given do not involve any principles of syntax, and most do not need any special mention. *fiducia*: Don. And. 3, 5, 7; 5, 3, 5; Hec. 4, 1, 13 (Sallust): Schol. Dan. 2, 61. (Cf. 1, 132.) Don. Ad. 5, 6, 6 (Verg. 2, 632): Schol. Dan. ad loc., s. v. *deo. via*: Don. Eun. 2, 2, 16: Schol. Dan. 4, 477. *nullus* for *non*: Don. Hec. 1, 2, 4; Eun. 2, 1, 10; Phor. 1, 4, 25: Schol. Dan. 1, 181; G. 1, 125 (Hec. 1, 2, 4). This use of *nullus* is found in the Epistles of Cic. ad Att. See Haupt, Quaest. Catull., p. 5; Reisig-Haase, 3, 158; Spengel, Ter. And. 370, 599; Lorenz, Plaut. Pseud. 282. *proprium* (*perpetuum*): Don. And. 5, 5, 4; 4, 3, 1 (Verg. 6, 872); Phor. 5, 5, 2 (Verg. 1, 73): Schol. Dan. B. 7, 31 (Ter. supra). *profecto*: Don. And. 3, 3, 22: Schol. Dan. 8, 532. *unde* (*ex quo*): Don. Ad. 3, 2, 4; Eun. Prol. 11 and 1, 2, 35 (Verg. 1, 6): Schol. Dan. ad loc., 8, 71. Don. *faxo*: Phor. 308, 1208 et al.: Schol. Dan. 12, 316. Here the latter commentator is correct, as *faxo* was certainly an archaism at the time of Terence. See the exhaustive work of E. Lübbert, Der Conjunctiv Perf. u. das Futurum exactum im ält. Lat., Breslau, 1867. *colere*: Don. Ad. 3, 2, 54: Schol. Dan. 1, 17. *confit*: Don. Ad. 5, 8, 23: Schol. Dan. 4, 116. *habet*: Don. And. 1, 1, 56: Schol. Dan. 12, 296 (Ter.). *ilicet* (*actum est*): Don. Phor. 1, 4, 31; Eun. 1, 1, 9; Ad. 5, 3, 5: Schol. Dan. 2, 424 (Ter.). *oblitus*: Eun. 2, 3, 14: Schol. Dan. 3, 628; 11, 866. Don. And. 3, 3, 47 *tute adeo. adeo modo et abundat, ut Vergilius G. 1, 24*. Schol. Dan. ad loc. *quidam adeo abundare putant antiqua figura, ut 3, 242*. Here we may also put the note of Donatus Ad. 2, 1, 15 *propter hunc: iuxta hunc*, and Schol. Dan. 1, 233 *ob Italiam. multi iuxta Italiam antiquo more dictum accipiunt*.

While the two commentators do not correspond in their statements in these comments, there are points at which they do agree. Occupying a middle ground there is a class of comments in which there is both agreement and disagreement. In commenting on the use of compound for simple verbs they sometimes say that

the preposition 'abundat,' sometimes refer to the words as archaisms. Don. And. 3, 2, 28 *renuntio. re syllaba apud veteres interdum abundat ut modo renuntio pro nuntio.* Re abundat is the explanation in other cases. See Smith, p. 21. The Schol. Dan. 2, 378 *retro pedem repressit aut retro vacat aut in repressit re vacat. sed veteres retro repressit dicebant.* 10, 766 *referens pro ferens more antiquo.* The same explanation is given of *reddita* 3, 333. There is quite a large number in which it is said of the preposition 'vacat' or 'abundat,' e. g. *adoro* 10, 677; *confieri* 4, 116; *ingreditur* 6, 157; *decedere* G. 4, 23. See Placek, *Re in den Compositis in Vergils Aeneis* (Program), Budweis, 1882. The use of the compound for the simple verb is common in the early comedy and in late writers influenced largely by the *sermo vulgaris* (Handbuch, 2, 552, 39).

As the Donatus seems to be the work of several hands, it is not possible to compare the genuine Donatus with the genuine Servius, but it is probable from the general resemblance of the Servius to Donatus that the original editions discussed archaisms in the same general way. As was shown in the comparison with Porphyryon, so in comparison with Donatus it is the Schol. Dan. which shows the greatest difference of treatment, and shows a much greater tendency to declare that an expression is an archaism. Still, the word *veteres* must not be interpreted too rigidly, as it can hardly be claimed that it was the intention of the writer to confine the limit of its use within the *veteres*. He was looking at Vergil's indebtedness to the past and showed what Vergil had borrowed, but in most cases he is silent in reference to the fate of an expression after the time of Vergil. Many a word which 'veteres dicebant' held its place in the current of language after the time of Vergil, but this the commentator neither affirms nor denies. This is true to a greater extent of the Schol. Dan. than of the Servius, which is the more valuable commentary.

To the Servius belong most of the comments concerning orthography, gender, case-forms, pronouns, adjective forms, prepositions and verb forms. Questions of syntax and the meaning of words are discussed chiefly in the Schol. Dan. Though there is no dividing line between the different classes of comments, still the Servius is characterized by comments on forms, the Schol. Dan. by comments on meanings. The comments of the latter are sometimes supplementary to the former,

and are frequently unsatisfactory, owing to the indefiniteness of the statement; e. g. ad 12, 268 *simul—simul* is termed antique, though the first example of its use is found in Caesar. The shortness of many of the comments, the repetitions, and the variance in the statements made indicate either that the work was never carefully revised by the author, or else that other hands have inserted, sometimes at random, such comments as came to mind. The writer of the Scholia is not in all cases well acquainted with the language of the Servius. Ad 1, 293 Servius says: *compaginis enim nemo penitus dicit*; *compagine* is found Schol. Dan. 4, 464. Servius G. 3, 245 *nos hic et haec leo dicimus*; *lea* namque usurpatum est. See 12, 519 *usurpata a poetis*. *Leam* is used Schol. Dan. B. 6, 22. Servius G. 3, 124 *nec pinguedo nec pinguetudo latinum est*. Schol. Dan. G. 3, 438 has *pinguedinem*. The word occurs also Schol. ad Persium 2, 63. 10, 306 *fragmina antique dictum*. G. 4, 303 *ramea fragmenta, id est ramorum fragmina*. It is not at all probable that in Servius the passages containing these words should have been written by the same person.

Considered as a whole, the comments do not have the exactness that we could wish. But we must bear in mind that Servius did not have at hand complete lexicons of Latin writers by means of which he might have traced the history of every word on which he commented. But if we consider his comments on archaisms, not as attempts to prove that such expressions were confined to the past, but that they were so used, most of them must be accepted as correct. As in the case of Donatus (see Smith, p. 31), there are some important omissions in the commentary of Servius. The genitives of the first declension in *ai*, the passive infinitive in *ier*, *ausim*, *fuat*, *-it* in the perfect, *-bāt* in the imperfect, and some of the figures mentioned by Donatus, ought certainly to be considered as archaisms, though not mentioned as such by Servius. There is some vagueness in some of the comments, as he does not attempt to decide which of several possible explanations ought to be accepted. He frequently records, not his own opinions, but those of others, and connects them with the words *aut . . . aut . . . aut*. He frequently states that a word or syllable 'vacat' or 'abundat,' or that an expression is antique, even though it would require the complete recasting of a line to avoid using it. Metrical exigencies, rather than an archaic tendency on the part of Vergil, will frequently explain what Servius considers an archaism.

Following the edition of Thilo-Hagen, the readings of the Schol. Dan. are given in italics. The shorter commentary has been spoken of as the Servius, while the word Servius has been used to refer to the entire work, without reference to the two versions. No attempt has been made to give all the references accessible, as this would result in needless repetition. Most of the passages referred to in Plautus and Terence have been annotated by different editors and are easily accessible. While the Commentary does not give us much information that cannot be found elsewhere, while some of the comments are incorrect and but very few fix the limits within which an expression was used, still there is much valuable material in the comments, and it is to be hoped that a careful consideration of the differences between the two versions which we have sought to emphasize may not be valueless as an aid to a better understanding of their relation to each other.

THE SERVIAN COMMENTS.

I. *Changes in Letters.*—A. *Vowels.*

The comments in reference to vowel changes are from the Servius. 10, 24 *moerorum pro murorum antique*. This is a genuine archaism, and numerous examples are cited. See Corssen, 1, 702; Seelmann, p. 165; Reisig-Haase, 1, 80. Two other comments are made, both based on a mistaken etymology: *stuppa* for *stippa* 5, 682, and *pennas* for *pinnas* 2, 479.

B. *Consonants.*

There are three important notes in the Servius and one in the Schol. Dan. referring to the changes in consonants.

1. *Aspiration.*—G. 3, 223 *inchoo, quod tamen maiores aliter scribebant, aspirationem interponentes duabus vocalibus, et dicebant inchoho. tria enim tantum habebant nomina, in quibus c litteram sequeretur aspiratio sepulchrum, orchus, pulcher, e quibus pulcher tantum hodie recipit aspirationem.* 6, 4 *anchora . . . apud maiores sine aspirationem proferebatur. contra thus et orchus veteres dicebant et lurcho . . . quibus sequens aetas detraxit aspirationem.* Cf. 1, 169; G. 1, 57. He is in doubt as to the aspiration of *harena* 1, 172, and 1, 213 states that *aena* by the *maiores* was spelled *ahena*. G. 1, 277, Schol. Dan. states that Probus and Cornutus differed as to the aspiration of *Orchus*. 8, 330 *Thybris* is derived from *ἰβρις*, nam amabant maiores ubi

aspiratio erat θ ponere. A similar statement is made B. 2, 11 in reference to S. The Early Latin did not have aspirated consonants. See Cic. Orator 48, 160; Quint. 1, 5, 20; Handbuch, 2, 251; Seelmann, p. 252 seqq.; Revue de Philologie 16, 184; (A. J. P. 15, 106.)

2. *Assimilation*.—1, 616 adplicat secundum praesentem usum per d prima syllaba scribitur, secundum antiquam orthographiam, quae praepositionum ultimam litteram in vicinam mutabat, per p, secundum euphoniā per a tantum. The list of similar words in Neue, 2, 709–11, shows that there is assimilation in a majority of the words, with numerous exceptions in Plautus, Terence and other writers. See Dorsch, Assimilation in den Compositis bei Plautus und Terentius (Prag, 1887). In Sallust assimilation does not take place. Constans, p. 3. Cf. Seelmann, p. 61; Munro, Lucr. 1⁴, 34.

3. *Rhotacism*.—4, 219 *veteres aras asas dicebant. sicut Vale-sios Valerios, Fusios Furios*. This is a well-known change, recognized by the Romans themselves. Varro, L. L. 7, 26; Macrobius, Sat. 3, 2, 8; Quint. 1, 4, 13. Cf. Cors. 1, 299; Seelmann, pp. 314–15.

II. Nouns.—A. Case Endings.

In the comments on the case forms there is some wavering on the part of the commentator, though the comments of the Servius are much more satisfactory than those of the Schol. Dan., and where they differ, the Servius is to be preferred.

1. *Nominative*.—The Schol. Dan. 1, 200 (*rabies*), 2, 374 (*segnities*), 11, 327 (*materies*), G. 1, 112 (*luxuries*), calls attention to the ending *ies* for *ia*. Both forms are classical, and are to be found in the Schol. Dan. (2, 215; G. 2, 367) and in the Servius (G. 3, 290; 4, 1; 2, 253; 3, 135). Plautus uses *intemperies*, *materies*, *segnities*. See Slaughter, p. 21. Am. Mar. uses both endings.

8, 383 omnia enim quae in eus exeunt hodie apud maiores in *es* mittebant, ut Nereus Neres, Tydeus Tydes. Editors now read *Nerei*, and Neue, 1, 329, gives examples of this form in early writers.

1, 293 ambages et compages antiqui tantum dicebant, posteritas admisit ut etiam compago dicatur. Probus, Cath. 1, 21 ambago non est Latinum. *Compago* is rare and not classical. See Krebs, s. v. (Cf. p. 174.)

10, 344, 788. It is stated that Caper mentions nom. *femen* without giving an example.

G. 2, 372 frons tenera fronds est vera lectio *et antiqua*. Lucr. (1, 18) frondiferasque domos avium.

1, 587 nubes tantum dicimus, non nubs. 10, 636 he states that Livius Andronicus used the short form.

12, 298 illud Ennii et Pacuvii penitus de usu recessit, ut hic torrus, huius torri dicamus. Also found Att. ap. Non. 15, 30.

2. *Genitive*.—11, 801 auras antiqua lectio. hinc paterfamilias et materfamilias quae tantum remanserunt: nam nec huius auras dicimus nec huius custodias secundum Sallustium, qui ait castella custodias thesaurorum. For form see Bücheler, Grundriss der lat. Declination, p. 32; Handbuch, 2, 338; for examples see Neue, 1, 5.

The difference between the comments on *Ulixi* (2, 7) and *Achilli* (3, 87) has been given p. 167. Charis. 8, 15, 52 refers to both words and says: *inveniuntur apud veteres quae sine ratione genetivum faciunt per i*. See Neue, 1, 331, 334.

G. 1, 208 libra die non est apocope pro diei sed (secundum antiquos *add. R. et Stephanus*) regularis genetivus est. Sall. ait dubitavit acie pars. *Plautus in Amphitruone* (1, 1, 120) *neque nos quoquam concedit die pro diei*. Cf. 1, 636. Gellius 9, 14, 7 quotes G. 1, 208 libra dies, and in 26 adds: C. Caesar in libro de analogia secundo huius die et huius specie dicendum putat.

1, 636 munera laetitiamque dei seemed to puzzle the commentators, as they were not certain of the text. Serv. id est *Liberi patris, ac per hoc vinum*. aut certe ut multi legunt laetitiam die, id est diei. . . . *non nulli dii legunt, sicut veteres famis fami*. Gellius 9, 14, 9 non dubium est quin dii scripserit pro diei. Sall. has *die* Jug. 52, 3; *acie* fr. Hist. 1, 107; *requie* 1, 99. See Neue, 1, 379; Munro, Lucr. 4, 1083; Brix, Plaut. Trin. 117.

G. 1, 129 virus hodie tres tantum habet casus: hoc virus, hoc virus, o virus. antiqui huius viri dicebant. This form is rare; but see Lachmann, ad Lucr. 2, 476; 6, 805; Neue, 1, 486.

3. *Dative*.—The dative in *u* is commented on 1, 156; 3, 540; 9, 602; 12, 511; G. 4, 158, 198. Gellius 4, 16, 9 quotes datives in *u* from Lucil., Verg. and Caesar, and adds that the latter considered the form in *u* as the proper one. Sallust has one example, *luxu*, J. 6, 1. The form is fairly common both in poetry and in prose. Neue, 1, 356-8; L. Müller, Q. Ennius, p. 194; Altenburg, p. 13; Schultze, p. 24.

4. *Vocative*.—1, 451; 1, 734; 8, 77; 11, 464; 12, 192 mention is made of a vocative in *us*, though in most of the comments an alternative is given, aut antiptosis aut antiquus vocativus. See Neue, 1, 83; Antoine, p. 30. (Cf. p. 171.)

5. *Forms of domus*.—In a long note 2, 445 the Schol. Dan. mentions a change in the declension of *domus* from the second declension to the fourth. Juvenal 3, 72 is quoted: viscera magnarum domuum. The forms used depend rather on the individual writers than on the period. For the gen. sing. *domi* (generally a locative) is used by the writers of comedy, *domus* by writers of the Augustan age. *Domui* in the dat. sing., *domo* in the abl. sing., and *domos*, acc. pl., are the forms most commonly used. *Domorum* is more common than *domuum*, and is found 4 times in Vergil and 8 times in Lucretius. See Neue, 1, 517-21; Bouterwek, p. 29.

The Servius 10, 244 comments on the vera lectio, crastina lux . . . spectabit. (See Val. Max. 2, 566.) The Schol. Dan. adds alii more antiquo lux pro luce accipiunt. Lucil. . . nox pro nocte. The Laws of the Twelve Tables are quoted by Gellius 8, 1 nox pro noctu. See also the quotation of *nox* by Macr. Sat. 1, 4, 19; Enn. A. 439 M.

B. Syntax.

The comments referring to syntax are found chiefly in the Schol. Dan., and in most instances refer to constructions that are poetical rather than archaic.

1. *Genitive*.—1, 14 dives opum modo tantum dives dicimus, antiqui adiungebant cuius rei, ut dives equum, dives pictai vestis et auri iungentes tantum genetivo casui. (1, 343; 9, 26; 9, 638.) This is also the view of Donatus ad Eun. 2, 2, 43, and apparently of Porphyrio ad Hor. Sat. 2, 3, 142. In Verg. the ablative is used 10, 563; B. 2, 20; G. 2, 136, 467. This usage is poetical. See Reisig-Haase, 3, 554, N. 525; Handbuch, 2, 421.

Egens with the genitive instead of the ablative is mentioned 9, 87; 11, 27; 11, 343; *laetus* 11, 73, while *largus opum* 11, 338 is simply mentioned as equivalent to *dives opum*.

2. *Dative*.—8, 127 cui . . . precari. antiquum est, nam modo quem precari dicimus. sane veteres et precor illi pro precor pro illo dicebant: Plautus in *Amphitryone* noli pessimo precari. The dative was used by Plautus, was gradually crowded out by the accusative, but came back into use during the Silver age. Krebs, s. v.

Three other poetical constructions with the dative are mentioned: 1, 475 *congregior* (Draeger, 1, 414); 4, 598; 8, 125; 8, 363; 10, 797 *subeo* (Draeger, 1, 381, 11). Schneemann, p. 46. B. 5, 5 *succedo*. With *succedo* the dative is classical. See Badstübner, p. 17. These verbs are quite frequently used by Vergil, and the construction is commented on several times in both versions.

3. *Accusative*.—10, 532 *talenta parce per accusativum Plautine dictum, qui ait in milite* (4, 6, 5) *parce vocem*. *parce* autem secundum antiquos serva, ut apud Lucilium et Ennium invenitur. Poetical. See Draeger, 1, 404, 4.

9, 399 *antique properet mortem*. Cf. 12, 425. See Constans, p. 167; Wordsworth, p. 623.

4, 575 *festinare fugam antique*. Not in Cicero, though elsewhere found with the acc. Sall. J. 73, 2; 77, 1; Tac. Ann. 4, 28, et al.

The use of the acc. with the above verbs is poetical and can hardly be regarded as archaic.

4. *Ablative*.—10, 329 *septem numero hoc est pro septem: veteres enim ita enuntiabant, Lucilius in IV triginti numero*. This use of *numero* is classical, and is also found Am. Mar. 16, 12, 26, 60; 22, 14, 8, so that it was in actual use at the time of Servius.

1, 75 *pulchra prole*. *quod nos per genetivum singularem dicimus, antiqui per septimum dicebant*. This use of the ablative is frequently referred to by Servius, but nowhere else is it called archaic. See Moore, p. 45; Smith, p. 15.

C. Gender.

Servius recognized the influence of the metre on the gender of the words used. 5, 122 *sciendum genera plerumque confundi aut metri ratione, aut hiatus causa*. But in his comments he generally considers a variation from the usual gender as an archaism. 9, 122 and 9, 467 he mentions *amnis*, fem. (Neue, 1, 672); G. 4, 247 *araneus* (Neue, 1, 620); G. 4, 296 *imbrex*, fem. (Neue, 1, 663); 2, 355 *lupus*, fem. (Neue, 1, 617); 10, 377 *obex*, fem. (Neue, 1, 665). Am. Mar. 21, 12, 13; 27, 10, 8 has *obex* in the fem.

7, 568 *specus hoc nomen apud maiores trium generum fuit. Ennius feminino posuit—Horatius masculino, . . . Vergilius neutro, quod hodie in numero singulari tribus tantum utimur casibus hoc specus, huius specus, o specus. nam pluralem tantum a genere masculino habemus in omnibus casibus*. Cf. G. 4, 417. Neue, 1,

346-7, 681 gives examples and references to Latin grammarians who mention this change of gender.

(3, 540 the edition of Lion has a comment on *armenta* in the fem., with quotations from Enn. and Pac. Neue, I, 552.)

D. Meanings.

1. *Noun for noun.*—Most of the nouns that properly belong here (*aetas*, *ars*, *axis*, *confidentia*, *fiducia*, *flictus* and *flumen*) have already been mentioned (pp. 167 foll.) in the comparison of the two versions or in the comparison with Donatus. There remain but five that can be placed here.

G. 1, 9. Both versions state: *generaliter aquam veteres Achei-loum vocabant.*

4, 424 the Schol. Dan. in a long note, quoting Plautus *Curculio* 1, 1, 5 and *Asinaria* 1, 3, 20, calls attention to the use of *hostem pro hospite*. This archaism is well known, from the words of Cic. de Off. 1, 37 *hostis enim apud maiores nostros dicebatur quem nunc peregrinum dicimus. Indicant duodecim tabulae aut status dies cum hoste, itemque: adversus hostem aeterna auctoritas . . . a peregrino enim recessit et proprie in eo qui arma contra ferret remansit.* See Reisig-Haase, 2, 38, 56; Wordsworth, pp. 519, 520; Brix, Plaut. Trin. 102.

1, 378 *vetuste pietatem pro religione posuit. Sall. . . delubra deum pietate . . . Plaut. in Pseud. non potest pietati obsisti. piare antiqui purgare dicebant; inde piamina, quibus expurgant homines.* The Servius 1, 545 speaks expressly of the *pietas* of Aeneas without any indication that the word is archaic. See also 5, 783; 12, 465. The Schol. Dan. 4, 141 *cum religiosum ostendit, dicit pium*; 4, 393 *probat religiosum*, does not consider the word an archaism. If we looked for uniformity of statement in all cases on the part of each commentator, it would seem from this that these comments represented the views of three commentators: Servius representing Aeneas as *pius* absolutely; another representing him as *pius religiosus*; a third, *pius antiquae religiosus*.

Piare is rare in prose, but is found Tacitus, Ann. 1, 42. See Draeger ad loc. *Piamina* is found Ovid, Fasti 2, 19; 3, 333; *piamen* 2, 32. (See Harper's Dict., s. v.)

Indulgitas, G. 2, 345, is supported by a quotation from Coelius and is also found Sisenna ap. Non. 126, 9. B. 8, 12 *laurus veteres laudum dicebant.*

(3, 55 *veteres plerumque truncum pro unoquoque genere interemptum dixerunt. Lione teste add. Guelferb. I.*)

2. *Archaic meanings.*—In this list may be placed the words which Servius has given as the names of things in days of old. 7, 730 *aclides sunt tela quaedam antiqua, adeo ut nequaquam commemorantur in bello.* Non. 554, 3 defines as *iacula brevia*. Along with this might be placed the word *cateia* 7, 741, as it equally merits a comment. 6, 234 *aerium, nomen montis antiquum.* 8, 332 *Albula antiquum nomen a colore.* 8, 63 *Tiberinus . . . ab antiquis Rumon dictus est, quasi ripas ruminans et exedens.*

6, 1 *vallum autem dicebant calam, sicut Lucilius scinde calam, ut caleas, id est, o puer frange fustes et fac focum.* A Lucilian pun.

1, 744 *arcturum . . . hanc quidam agere arcton dicunt, quia arceram veteres vehiculum vocabant.* Varro, L. L. 5, 140 *vehiculum . . . arcera dictum.* The word is quoted from an old law by Gellius 20, 1, 25, and in 29 is given the description: *arcera . . . quasi arca quaedam magna.*

8, 336 *antique vates carmentes dicebantur.* 2, 19; 2, 53; 8, 242 *cavernae concava loca.*

11, 496 *quidam cervicibus plu. num. secundum veteres dictum volunt, et Hortensium primum singulari numero cervicem.* The sing. is found in Pac. ap. Cic. Divin. 2, 64, 133; in Cat., Lucr., Hor. et al.; the plural is found Lucil. 6, 34; Inc. 101 M., and is the only form in Sall. and Cic. See Varro, L. L. 6, 78; Reisig-Haase, 1, 193, N. 154; Krebs, s. v.

There are a number of comments calling attention to a special or transferred meaning of a word. The Schol. Dan. refers this usage to the *veteres*, though the words are of common occurrence, and the same meaning can be frequently given to them. 4, 194 *cupido (immoderatus amor)*; 1, 155 *Dei (patres)*. Cf. 2, 632; 8, 187; Macrobius 2, 8, 2; Weissenborn, Livy 8, 9, 6. 10, 398; 11, 732 *dolor (ardor)*; 1, 215; 11, 571 *ferae (quadrupedes)*; 11, 299 *fremitus (aquae sonitus)*. Cf. G. 1, 13; 4, 168 *pecus (animal)*; 11, 322 *struices*.

G. 1, 109 the archaic and provincial use of *elices* is mentioned. 8, 203 *Hercules* as a heroic epithet is supported by a quotation ad 8, 564 from Varro: *omnes qui fecerant fortiter hercules vocabantur.* 9, 603 is mentioned *flexuntes*, the old name of the Roman cavalry, a statement supported by Pliny 33, 2, 9, 35. Of more importance is the comment 10, 306 *fragmina antique dictum.* See com. 1, 275 *tegmen*. *Fragmen* is poetical and post-Augustan, frequent in Lucr. and Verg. In the hexameter, words in *men* are much the more common, the favorite position

being in the fifth foot. (See Ovid *passim*.) *Men* is the earlier form (Reisig-Haase, I, 171, N. 125), though Plautus has 48 words in *mentum*, 19 in *men*; Terence 14 in *mentum*, 7 in *men*; Cato 10 in *mentum*, 2 in *men*. In Silver Latin there was a preference for the longer form. See Slaughter, pp. 23-4. Nouns in *mentum* are rarely used by Cicero and his contemporaries. Constans, p. 8. For the usage of Tacitus see Philol. XXV, pp. 99-100. Cf. Altenburg, p. 15; Schubert, *De Lat. Verb. Form.*, pp. 23-4; Paucker, *Vorarbeit zur lat. Sprachgeschichte*, p. 13; Rönisch, *Italia und Vulgata*, p. 28.

12, 468 *virago . . . id est mulier quae animum viri habet: has antiqui viras dicebant*. Isid. Orig. II, 2, 23 *quae nunc femina, antiquitus vira vocabatur*. Cf. Suet. Cal. 8 *antiqui puellas pueras dictitarent*.

9, 484 *funera*. Both versions have explanations, the Schol. Dan. adding to the Servius. *apud maiores funeras dicebant eas ad quas funus pertinet, ut sororem, matrem: vel derivavit veteres secutus ut funeram pro funesta diceret, ut homo scelerus sicuti scelestus vel scelerosus dicebatur*. Plautus in *Pseudulo* (3, 2, 28) *teritur sinapis scelera, in eadem* (4, 5, 3) *nunc iube venire Pseudulum, scelerum caput, id est scelestum*. See *Neue Jahrbücher für Phil. u. Paed.* 1891, p. 676 foll.; (A. J. P. 15, 97.)

The Servius 8, 649 comments on *coclites, luscus dixerunt antiqui*; 11, 708 *fraus (poena)*; B. I, 32 *peculium (patrimonium)*; 1, 176 mentions *pinsores qui nunc pistores vocantur*. *pinsere autem dici Persius probat, ut a tergo quem nulla ciconia pinsit*. The noun is found Varro ap. Non. 152, 14. The verb is found chiefly in early writers.

4, 320 *nihil intererat apud maiores inter regem et tyrannum, ut* (7, 266) *pars mihi pacis erit dextram tetigisse tyranni*. 7, 266 this is spoken of as a Greek usage. It is poetical, following the Greek. See Krebs, s. v.

11, 687 *apud maiores indiscrete virgo dicebatur et mulier*. See also Don. Ter. 4, 5, 16. This is a poetical usage. See Smith, p. 19.

III. Pronouns.

In commenting on the pronouns, the Servius is much better than the Schol. Dan., and all the archaisms mentioned by it are genuine archaisms. 2, 595 *nostri autem et vestri genetivus est antiquus et ex Graeco veniens, sicut singularis est mis et tis*. Prisc. 13, 2, 4 states that Enn. used *mis sis tis*. Quint. 8, 3, 25

mentions *mis* as an archaism of Vergil's. Neue, 2³, 347; Brix, Plaut. Trin. 343.

3, 477 *ecce tibi aut vacat tibi . . . aut certe tibi id est quod ad te attinet: nam ita veteres ponebant, ut Terentius in Adelphis* (4, 1, 24) *en tibi autem: quid est? lupus in fabula.* 5, 162 *vacat mihi, ut solet plerumque.* See also 8, 84. The ethical dative is found chiefly in the comic writers and in Cicero's Epistles. Reisig-Haase, 3, N. 542; Draeger, 1, 433. The same difference between the two versions is seen 1, 3 *multum ille et ille hoc loco abundat . . . est autem archaismos. aut certe ille quia haec particula more antiquo aut nobilitati aut magnitudini dabatur.* See 3, 558; 10, 707; 12, 5. For this pleonastic use of *ille* see Draeger, 1, 84, 39. 11, 236 *olli secundum Ennium.* Though frequently occurring, not elsewhere mentioned as an archaism. Neue, 2³, 423-4.

1, 95 quis of the third declension is noticed. *denique Cato in originibus ait ques sunt populi et declinavit ques quium, ut puppes puppium.* Examples are numerous. See Neue, 2³, 496; Engelbrecht, p. 40. 4, 98 *sed quis erit (modus) archaismos.* Evidently taken as a plural.

B. 3, 1 Servius very correctly says: *cuium autem antique ait.* This form is of frequent occurrence in Plautus and Terence. See Engelbrecht, p. 41; Neue, 2³, 471; Brix, Plaut. Trin. 45.

IV. Adjectives.

1. *Form.*—Nearly all the comments on adjectives refer to their meaning, and have already been given p. 167. Four comments refer to form, and are all from the Servius. The comment on *alacris* (masculine) is given p. 171. 6, 603 *adsimilis valde similis: ad enim vacat, et ab maioribus ad ornatum adhibebatur, ut Hor. qua populus adsita.* (Ep. 2, 2, 170.) *Adsimilis* is poetical and post-Augustan, but is found once in Cic., N. D. 2, 55, 136. Krebs, s. v. *Beliebt war a. im P. L. seit Plautus.*

3, 539 and 12, 519 the form *paupera* is quoted from Plautus. It is also found in the Vulgate and in very late writers. See Neue, 2³, 25.

2. *Meanings.*—All the comments referring to the meaning of adjectives are found in the Schol. Dan., and, as in the case of the nouns, little that is new is presented. Most of them are very short and, excepting four, need no special notice.

11, 651 *bipennis* (duas pennas); 1, 4 *memor* (ὁ μνημένος and ὁ μνήμων); 3, 119 *pulcher* (*exsoletus*); 12, 463 *pulverulentus* (*sicut vinolentus*). Cf. Gell. 19, 7, 7; 2, 285 *tristis* (*nubilus*).

9, 638 *cum veteres natalem diem vel locum vel tempus dicerent, ut Hor. (O. 1, 21, 10) natalem diem Delon Apollinis, et Plautus in Pseud. natalem hunc mihi diem scitis esse, Vergilius his omissis dixit Phyllada mitte mihi, meus est natalis, Iolla.* B. 3, 76 sane natalis apud maiores plenum fuit, licet posteritas natalis dies dicere coeperit: nam cum Hor. dixerit natales grate numeras, Iuvenalis ait (12, 1) natali, Corvine, die mihi dulcior haec lux. The ellipse of *dies* is not common in classical Latin, and is not found in the Orations of Cicero. Don. Ter. Phor. 1, 1, 14 Vergilius serviens personae rusticae meus est natalis inquit nec addidit dies. See Mayor ad Juv. 12, 1; Krebs, s. v.; Moore, p. 47.

12, 694 *verius alii veteri more dictum accipiunt: verum enim quod rectum et bonum esset, appellabant: Ter. inde est verum modo? ... Sall. in primo ea paucis, quibus peritia et verum ingenium est, abnuentibus.* Don. says nothing about an archaism Andr. 4, 1, 5, and the word with the same meaning is found Caes. B. G. 4, 8, 2; Hor. Sat. 2, 3, 312; Ep. 1, 7, 98.

G. 3, 175 *vescum apud antiquos significabant macrum et quasi quod escam non reciperet. Afranius ... puer est vescus ... Lucr. certe pro edace posuit, ut (1, 326) vesco sale saxa peresa.* Cf. G. 4, 131. Ribbeck, Lat. Partik., p. 10, makes *vescus* = *ve-escus* with both an active and a passive meaning, 'nagend' and 'abgenagt.' The active meaning is to be assigned to it in the passage cited from Lucretius; Festus, p. 368; Lucil. ap. Gell. 16, 5, 7; Non., p. 186. It is passive in Vergil, in Afranius, in Ovid, F. 3, 446 *vesca parva vocant*, and elsewhere. See also Munro, Lucr. 1, 326.

B. 4, 19 *errantes hederas passim vagantes. unde antiqui lyrii dixerunt flexipedes hederas, quod hac atque illac vagantur.* The only passage where the expression is found is Ovid, Met. 10, 99. If this is the one that Servius had in mind, he has made a broad assertion and has used *antiquus* of a comparatively late Roman author.

3. *Comparison.*—4, 31 *magis dilecta sorori. id est dilector: nam antiqui frequenter pro comparativo iungebant particulam magis.* 5, 725 *care magis pro carior.* Ter. (Eun. 5, 4, 12) *magis elegans.* The comparison with *magis* was required with some adjectives, and in poetry the *magis* was used for the sake of the

meter. See Wölfflin, *Comparison*, pp. 31-4; Reisig-Haase, 3, 163, N. 398; Altenburg, p. 17.

4. *Numerals*.—The comments on the numerals refer to the form of *ambo* and *duo*, and the use of distributives and multipliers for the cardinal numbers. B. 5, 68 *duo vetuste dixit ut ambo* (6, 18) . . . *hodie hoc significatu duos et ambos dicimus*. Cf. 12, 342. In poetry the metre often decides which form is to be used. *Duo* was the original form, but it gradually acquired the regular acc. plural ending *os*, and is the form most commonly used in prose. Neue, 2³, 277; Archiv, 3, 550.

The use of substitutes for cardinal numbers is poetical, but the explanations of the comments vary. 1, 313 *bina . . . antiquus mos est bina pro duobus poni sicut et duplices*. See 1, 93, 8, 168 *bina poetice*. 10, 329 *more suo*. Elsewhere, e. g. B. 5, 67; 7, 140, the numeral is given without comment by Servius. The usage is not classical. Draeger, 1, 107; Neue, 2³, 321, 331.

V. *Particles*.

1. *Form*.—8, 423 *hoc tunc id est huc tum . . . crebro in antiquis lectionibus invenitur, sicut in epistulis Verrius Flaccus probat exemplis, auctoritate, ratione, dicens pro u 'o' maiores ponere consuetos*. Attius, Lucilius and Ennius have *huc*. *Hoc* is found in Plautus and in Cicero's Epistles. Brix, *Plaut. Capt.* 329, 480; Wordsworth, 102; Neue, 2³, 613.

Here we may also place *ergo*: 6, 670 *coniunctio fuit sed per accentus mutationem in adverbium transiit, et est sola particula, quae habet in fine circumflexum*. As a preposition *ergo* is not used by Plaut. and Ter., but is found Sisenna, fr. 120 (Peter); Quadrigarius ap. Gell. 3, 8, 8; Lucr. 3, 78. In classical writers it is found chiefly in quotations from old laws or in religious formulae, e. g. Livy 37, 47; 40, 52; Cic. de Legg. 2, 23, 59; 3, 4, 9. Reisig-Haase, 1, N. 236; Krebs, s. v.

With these may also be placed the comparative *ocius*: 8, 555 *ocius positivus antiquus est . . . tractum ex Graeco ὀκείως*. 9, 402 *ocius pro ociter*. Neue, 2³, 213: "Zu *ocius* . . . kennen wir allein den adv. *ociter* aus Apul. Met. 1, 23, 72 und Serv. Verg. 9, 402." The use of the comparative for the positive is noticed 1, 228; 6, 304 without special comment. The comment in the Schol. Dan. seems to be a late one, and the word *ociter* belongs to the time of the writer. *Ocius* occurs frequently in Am. Mar. as a positive.

2, 651 *praepositiones vel adverbia in a exeuntia modo producunt*

ultimam litteram, excepto puta et ita, apud Ennium et Pacuvium brevia sunt.

2. *Position.*—G. 4, 444 *nam*, hodie enim *nam* particula postponitur antea praeponitur, Ter. in Phor. (5. 1, 5) *nam* quae est haec anus. Donatus ad loc. 'Ἀναστροφή ut Vergilius. The position of *nam* is due to metrical causes. For the instances in the Augustan poets where *nam* is postpositive see Draeger, 2, 155, §349; Lachmann, Lucr. Com., p. 246; Smith, p. 14.

3.—There are two other comments from the Servius: 3, 686 *ni pro ne* Plautus *ni mala ni stulta sis*. Cf. Don. Eun. 2, 3, 36; 3, 3, 2. Neue, 2³, 969. 9, 37 *heia est* Ennianum. Cf. 4, 569 *heia saepe age significat*. Neue, 2³, 982.

A few comments not already referred to are found in the Schol. Dan.: 1, 329 *an pro sive. comminus (veteres in loco ponebant)*. Hand Tursell., s. v. Servius explicat quod abhorret ab usu Vergili. 2, 382 *haud secus. non aliter*. 12, 268 *simul—simul antique, ut* 1, 631; 12, 758. Found first in Caes. B. G. 4, 13, is not in Cic. or Sall. From the time of Vergil is common, except in Silver Latin. See Draeger, Tac. Agr. 25; Hist. Syn. 2, 94. 2, 680 *subitum pro subito*, a common use of the adj. instead of the adv. See 11, 583 *aeternum id est aeterne*. G. 1, 248 *sera pro sero*.

VI. Prepositions.

With the exception of two comments—1, 233 *ob (iuxta)* and 12, 437 *inter (ad)*—all the comments on the prepositions are from the Servius. The comment of the Schol. Dan. on *inter* is an addition to the comments of the Servius, which makes similar comments without any reference to an archaism, e. g. 1, 231 in (*pro*), 2, 60 in (*ad, contra*). The comments of the Servius refer to the origin, position and use of the preposition. 6, 670 he explains *ergo* with the gen. as an adverb formed by change of accent. In other comments he speaks of the change of accent of words, but cannot decide whether they are adverbs or prepositions. 6, 409 *longo post aut adverbium est, aut praepositio antique posita*. 4, 416 *litore circum postposita praepositio et accentum mutavit et perdidit vires. circum non est praepositio sed adverbium loci*. Cf. 12, 177; B. 5, 3. The prepositions were originally adverbs, and some of them retained their adverbial force and position after the noun even after they became prepositions. Neue, 2³, 762; Reisig-Haase, 3, N. 570 *b*; Handbuch, 2, 453, 152.

The change of case after certain prepositions is mentioned 1, 295 *saeva sedens arma secundum antiquam licentiam*. *sciendum tamen est hodie in et sub tantum communes praepositiones*. *ceterum super et subter iam accusativae sunt, sicut clam et post, quae ante communes fuerunt*. *nunc in his mutata natura est*. B. 1, 29 *longo post tempore aut archaismos est*; *antiqui enim post ante circum etiam ablativo iungebant, quod hodie facere minime possumus*. In classic prose *clam* is used only as an adverb. As a preposition in a few doubtful instances with the ablative. Archiv, 7, 278: with the acc. it is vulgar and archaic. Krebs, s. v.; Handbuch, 2, 453, 151. For *circum*, *ante* and *post* see Krebs, s. v.; Neue, 2³, 762 seqq. *Super* with the abl. is poetical and late prose. In Early Latin it is used with the acc. *Subter* with the abl. is found only in Catull. and Vergil. See Handbuch, 2, 453; Weissenborn, Livy 2, 14, 4; Doberenz, Caes. B. C. 2, 10, 4.

Most of the comments on the prepositions refer to the preposition *in*. 1, 253 and 6, 203 Servius speaks of the *antiqua licentia communium praepositionum*, and 1, 176 quotes *in nubem* (G. 1, 442), *in alvo* (2, 401), *super arma* (2, 295), *super arbore* (6, 203), and Cic. *quod ille in capite . . . acceperat, and fortes fueritis in eo*. *In* with the ablative instead of the acc. is called *archaismos* 2, 541; 6, 339; 9, 441; 10, 387, 807, 838; B. 8, 83. 11, 686 *silvis pro in silvis: et est archaismos*. Lachmann, Lucr. 6, 630, commenting on the words *pluit in terris* (10, 807), says: Servius mire *archaismos* dicit *in terris . . . quod mihi antiqua simplicitate additum esse potius videtur*. The distinction in the use of the cases with the prepositions does not seem to have been so marked in early as in later Latin. See Wordsworth, p. 450; Draeger, 1, 660; Rönisch, Itala und Vulgata, pp. 406-7; Reisig-Haase, 3, 710.

VII. Verbs.

1. *Form.*—The comments in the Schol. Dan. call attention to the change of conjugation of *fervere* and *lavere* (8, 677; 4, 169; G. 3, 221) and *stridere* (2, 418; G. 4, 555), and the participial form *ostentus* for *ostensus* (G. 1, 248). Cf. 9, 20. Both of the forms are found. Neue, 2³, 569-72. 12, 316 *faxo* is termed *archaismos*.

The comments of the Servius do not mention the passive infinitive in *ier*, *it* in the perfect, *bāt* in the imperfect, *ausim* nor *fuat* as archaisms, though it does call attention to the other most

important archaisms. *osus sum*, an old perfect of *odi*, is given 5, 687. See Neue, 2², 347, 617. G. 1, 262 obtusi antiqui n addebant. Cf. 1, 480. In early writers this word is spelled both ways, but the form in *n* is the more common. Neue, 2², 568; Reisig-Haase, 1, 376, N. 296. Am. Mar. 15, 12, 4 obtunsis.

11, 467 iusso, antiquum. Seneca, Ep. 6, 6, 3. *accestis* (1, 200), *extinxem* (4, 606) and *vixet* (11, 118) are mentioned as cases of syncope; *direxti* (6, 57), *extinxti* (4, 692) and *traxe* (5, 786) are not mentioned. For lists of examples see Proll; for the grammatical treatment, Lübbert.

1, 144 adnexus antiquum est, ut conixus, quibus hodie non utimur; dicimus enim adnissus et conissus. sed et multa alia usus contra antiquitatem vindicavit. illi parsi dicebant, nos dicimus peperci. item nos dicimus suscepi illi dicebant succepi. The last form is used by Verg. 1, 175; 6, 249. *Parsi* is ante-classical and poetical. Neue, 2², 474; Reisig-Haase, 1, 317, N. 286 *k*. The forms in *nissus* are more common than those in *nixus*. Neue, 2², 375; Reisig-Haase, 1, 376, N. 295 *e*.

9, 409 conicit antiquum est. The form in *con* is quoted by Gellius 17, 2, 10, and the form in *co*, 16, 7, 5. *Coniciunt*, Am. Mar. 23, 6, 87. For the dropping of *n* in *con* before *i* see Dorsch, p. 31. The use of *conicit* was not confined entirely to the antique, for it is found in the Servius 7, 346; B. 4, 7.

G. 2, 384 saluere antiqui salui dicebant. Diom. 1, 374, 5 K. plerique veterum salui dixerunt, ut Vergilius. *Salui* is the form used by Vergil and Ovid. Reisig-Haase, 1, 375, N. 295-295 *c*; Neue, 2², 482-4.

4, 66 est verbum est indeclinabile . . . invenimus, sed quod abolitum est, *et* edo es est, unde est edere et comedere, quod hodie non dicimus. 5, 785 edo habet et rectam, sed antiquam declinationem, ut edo edis edit. The short forms are common both in prose and poetry. The longer forms are not uncommon in early poetry. Neue, 2², 603.

6, 468 lenibat pro leniebat et antique dixit, ut 7, 436 polibant pro poliebant. The Servius uses the word 7, 34. The other examples of this form are not commented on. Only one example is cited from early prose-writers: Quadrigarius, fr. 77, Peter. For lists of examples see Neue, 2², 444; Kühn, p. 19; Wordsworth, p. 145; Westphal, p. 118.

There are a number of comments in both versions calling attention to a change from the active to the deponent form, or the reverse. 1, 527; 12, 263 (populo), 11, 169 (*digno*), G. 1, 185

(*munero*), G. 1, 193 (*medico*), et al. The examples of this change are numerous. See Jahnsson, p. 75; Reisig-Haase, 1, 356-7; Neue, 3³, 37, 55.

2, 471 *mala pastus gramina legimus et* (10, 709) *silva pastus harindunea . . . rarum apud antiquos*. (Neue, 3³, 14.) The use of the participle with a middle meaning is common in the poets of the Augustan age. It is rare in Early Latin, was introduced into prose by Sall., and into poetry by Vergil. It is rarely found in Livy, Tacitus and later writers. See Schaeffler, *Die sogenannte Syn. Graec. bei Aug. Dichtern*; Jahnsson, p. 62; Antoine, pp. 52-6.

2. *Compound verbs*.—The use of the compound for the simple verbs has already been noticed (p. 172-3). The Schol. Dan. 12, 136 *aspectabat amat usurpare antiquitatem*. The compound form is common in Plaut. and Verg. Overhalhaus, p. 16. This comment seems to indicate that the commentator thought that the compound form was archaic. There are two comments that oppose this view: 12, 709 *cernere ferro vera et antiqua est lectio, nam Ennium secutus est qui ait olle cernebant magnis de rebus agentes. posteritas coepit legere decernere ferro*. The same statement occurs Sen. Ep. 6, 6, 3. 4, 390 *linquens multi pro relinquens Aeneam, alii pro deficiens volunt more antiquo*. The use of the simple for the compound is poetical. Handbuch, 2, 552, 36-9; Draeger, 1, 136, 85. "More veterum," Constans, p. 48. Riemann (*Langue et Grammaire de Tite-Live*, p. 191) combats the poetical theory.

Somewhat similar to this are the comments in reference to the use of a compound verb instead of a simple verb with a preposition. 7, 217 *adferimur urbem ad urbem ferimur*. 1, 147 *perlabitur undas figura est. quod enim dicimus per praepositionem nomini copulatam sequente verbo, antiqui verso ordine praepositionem detractam nomini iungebant verbo . . . nos dicimus per undas labitur, illi dicebant perlabitur undas. item per forum curro et percurro forum*. See 1, 307. Lucr. 5, 762 *perlabitur undas*; 5, 475 *per summas labier oras*. Tib. 4, 1, 127 *perlabitur auras*. See Keller, p. 38. The simple verb with the prep. is much more common than the compound, which is poetical, though the use of each form was affected by the metre.

12, 816 *adiuro pro iuro*. 12, 197 *sidera iuro ornatior elocutio et crebra apud maiores quam si velis addere praepositionem*. (1, 67 *navigat aequor figura graeca nos dicimus per aequor navigat*.) The regular construction is the acc. with *per*. The

acc. without the prep. is poetical, 'nach griech. Muster.' Siebelis, Ovid, Met. 2, 44. The construction with *adiuro* is the same, the only exceptions being Catullus 66, 40; Vergil 12, 816. The comment in the last two instances seems to be based on the passages under consideration.

3. *Verb for verb.*—All of the comments referring to this usage are from the Schol. Dan., and call attention to the transferred meaning of the words under consideration. None of the meanings given depart very far from the usual meaning of the words, and the comments are of little importance. 9, 693 *se agebat* (*veniebat*); 12, 657 *mussat* (*timet, tacet*); G. 1, 18 *favere* (*velle*); 4, 193; 9, 56 *fovere* (*inhabitare*); 4, 244 *resignare* (*adsignare*); G. 1, 29; 8, 672 *venire, ire* (*esse*); 1, 52 *vastus* (*desolatus*).

4. *Archaic meanings.*—Among the comments referring to the archaic verbs there are a number on words which had a religious connotation. In the Schol. Dan. the most important of these are on *adoro* and *macte*. 10, 677 *adoro id est iuxta veteres, qui adorare adloqui dicebant. nam ideo et adorea laus bellica quod omnes eum cum gratulatione adloquebantur, qui in bello fortiter fecit.* Handbuch, 2, 621, 18: "So scheint es, dass das Wort *adorare* (als Kompositum) den älteren Latein noch völlig fremd war. Denn die ältesten Stellen, wo es mit Sicherheit nachzuweisen ist, findet sich erst bei Vergil und Livius; und doch hätten Plautus, Lucrez, Varro und vor allem Cicero sehr oft Anlass gehabt, es zu gebrauchen wenn sie es eben gehabt hätten." The comment on *macte* 9, 638 refers to two points: *veteres macte esto dicebant, mactus ap. vet. etiam mactatus dicebatur.* Neue, 2³, 178-81 cites numerous examples without *esto* from the early writers. See Reisig-Haase, 3, 537, N. 519 a; Antoine, pp. 32-4. Krebs, s. v. The definition given of *macte* is *magis aucte*, and it seems to be the old participle of the verb of which *macto* is the frequentative. Wordsworth, p. 618.

10, 270 *apere* (*adligare*); Festus 18 M. *apere comprehendere.* B. 8, 71 *cantare, unde et excantare magicis carminibus obligare.* Plaut. in *Bacch.* 33. 1, 17 *colere*; 4, 301 *commotis sacris verbo antiquo usum tradunt.* Plaut. in *Pseud.* *commovissem sacra.* 2, 669 *instaurata* (*renovata*). 1, 543 *sperare*.

Five other comments are found in the Schol. Dan.: *celebrat*, a variant reading of some 4, 641; *fultus super quod iacebat fultus dicebatur* B. 6, 53. Cf. 4, 247; 6, 604; *effultus* 8, 368. *res rapere* (*laedere*) 10, 14; *vocari* 10, 241. (Ed. Lion, 1, 59 verrant archaismos.)

There are but few comments in the Servius which belong to this division. They are chiefly the retention of old special meanings. 6, 90 *addita inimica. est autem verbum Lucili et antiquorum, ut Plaut. (Aul. 3, 6, 19) additus Ioni Argus. Macr. Sat. 6, 4, 2* calls attention to the archaism. For other instances of the use of the word see Plaut. Mil. 146, 298; Hor. O. 3, 4, 76. 6, 229 *circumtulit purgavit antiquum verbum est. Plautus te circumferam id est purgabo. Non. 261, 26 circumferre est proprie lustrare.* 7, 804 *florentes, Ennius et Lucretius florere dicunt omne quod nitidum est. Lucr. 5, 1442 florebat navibus pontus. Poetical usage. See Bindley ad Tertull. Apol., p. 43.* There are two other comments—12, 352 *adspirat (accedit)* and B. 1, 8 *inbuere (perfundere)*—both of which refer to rather common meanings of the words. The first occurs several times in Gellius, and the second is found Minucius, Oct. 30, 5. 3, 42 *scelerare polluere, et est sermo Plautinus, quo hodie non utimur. nomen tamen sine verbi origine, non enim dicitur scelero.* The verb occurs in Statius, Theb., and in his comments Lactantius Placidus does not call the word archaic.

1, 56 *apud antiquos enim sedet considerat significabat, ut alio loco ait Turnus sacrata valle sedebat. 9, 4 secundum Plautum sedere est consilium capere. 4, 15 sederet placeret, ut (2, 660) et sedet hoc animo.* Here the transferred meaning of the word arises from the mental action of the one seated.

VIII. Tropes and Figures.

The tropes and figures referred to by Servius have been fully discussed by Moore. There does not seem to be any uniformity of comment, as Servius frequently refers to an expression as a figure, while in other similar instances it is not mentioned.

11, 160 *vivendi vici. id est supervixi: veteres enim vivendo vincere dicebant supervivere, ut multa virum volvens volvendo saecula vincit. Plautus in Epidico (2, 1, 8) quia licuit eum vivendo vincere.* Though not mentioned as a separate figure, except under the name parhomoeon, alliteration is one of the characteristics of Early Latin writers, though condemned by later critics. 3, 183 *casus Cassandra canebat haec compositio iam vitiosa est: quae maioribus placuit, ut (82) Anchisen agnovit amicum, et (5, 866) sale saxa sonabant.* A similar comment occurs 2, 199, but 5, 866 simply the imitation of sound is mentioned. See Munro, Lucr. 2^d, pp. 15-16; L. Müller, Q. Ennius, p. 248. Moore, pp. 52-3.

Antiptosis, or the use of one case for another, is frequently mentioned by Servius, though he often refers to it simply as a figure. Most of the comments have already been given: *pulchra prole* 1, 75; *Bacchus* 1, 734; *perlabitur undas* 1, 147. 1, 573 *urbem quam statuo vestra est. hoc schema de antiquioribus sumptum possimus accipere. ait Cato in legem Voconiam agrum quem vir habet tollitur, et Ter. Eun. (4, 3, 11) quem dedisti nobis, quas turbas dedit.* 1, 120 figura qua plerumque utuntur poetae. See Moore, pp. 44-7; Smith, p. 15.

4, 598 *quem secum patrios et reliqua. quidam in utroque versu pro quem legunt (qui) ut sit vetus figura per ellipsin: ubi sunt qui aiunt patrios penates portasse et parentem umeris subisse.*

110 instances of ellipsis are noted by Servius, though he does not often use the technical word. Moore, p. 59.

Epexegesis, though noticed quite frequently by Servius, is referred to but once as an archaism: 1, 12 *tenuere coloni deest quam. amant namque antiqui per epexegesin dicere quod nos interposito pronomine exprimimus.* Moore, p. 57.

1, 464 *inani epitheton est picturae . . . nam apud veteres παρατο- τεχνία vel ψευδοτεχνία dicta est.* See Moore, pp. 17-20.

12, 680 *furere ante furorem figura antiqua, ut servitutum servit, dolet dolorem.* 2, 53 *Graeca figura ut vitam vivere, mortem mori.* This is common in all periods of the language, but is especially frequent in archaic writers, e. g. Apuleius. See Landgraf, *De Figuris Etymologicis Ling. Lat. Act. Sem. Erlang.* 2, pp. 1-69.

1, 161 *inque sinus antiqua est locutio sic ipse alibi inque salutatam linquo. C. Memmius . . . inque luxuriosissimis Asiae oppidis.* 1, 412 *figura est tmesis . . . faciebat antiquitas, ut cere comminuit brum.* Brix, *Plaut. Trin.* 833; Moore, p. 34.

G. 1, 24 *tuque adeo. adeo hic praecipue. quidam adeo abundare putant antiqua figura, ut (3, 242) omne adeo genus in terris.* Cf. 11, 487 *adeo vacat.* See p. 172.

IX. *Novae Elocutiones.*

Closely connected with the comments on archaisms are the twenty-eight comments in which Servius has commented on the *nova dicta* of Vergil. Some of the comments are incorrect, others seem to call attention to the common poetical property of the age of Vergil. *caprigenum pecus* 3, 221 is like *c. genus* ap. *Macr. Sat.* 6, 5, 14. *noctivago* 10, 321 ap. *Macr. Sat.* 6, 5, 12. *superat* is found in Caesar. *macte* without *esto* 9, 638, and *indulgentia* G. 2, 345 are found in Cic. *labores praebeuit* 10, 321 equals

Caesar's *opinionem timoris praebuit*. *nutribat* 11, 572 is found in early authors with the same meaning, and is used by Vergil again 7, 485. (*locum quo litore* 7, 477), the relative between two nouns is repeated Verg. 1, 517; 5, 570; 7, 409. *vulnera siccabat lymphis* 10, 834, and *ruit ad caelum* G. 2, 308 are but slightly changed from the words of Lucil. and Lucr. *mensae erili* 7, 490 is paralleled by Plaut. Bacch. 2, 1, 1; *currum et rotas instabant* 8, 433 by *instant mercaturam* ap. Non. 212, 30. *aligerum* 1, 663; *occumbere morti* 2, 62; *sacris litatis* 4, 50 and *minores* 9, 263 belong to the age of Vergil. *maculis albis* 9, 48 occurs without comment 5, 565. On *prorumpit nubem* 3, 572; *biuugo* 5, 144; *vola* 5, 53 both versions have comments, and the Schol. Dan. mentions the new diction. The other expressions commented on are *armenta* 1, 185; *lentandus* (?) 3, 384; *excussa magistro* 6, 353; *Inarime* 9, 712; *cedat ius* 11, 358; *ater odor* 12, 591; *exudatumor* G. 1, 88; *saxea umbra* G. 3, 145.

The comments on *superat* are the most varied: 3, 339 *superatne vivit*. *sane nove dictum est et caret exemplo ut pauca in Vergilio*. G. 2, 314 *superat superest, ut quid puer Ascanius? superatne?* This comment is repeated 12, 630. 2, 597; 5, 713; B. 9, 27 the word is defined *superest* in spite of the statement 3, 339.

X. *Neotericae Elocutiones.*

The comments in which Servius has referred an expression to the *neoterici* do not differ much from those in the last division. Persius is put among the *neoterici* (6, 187), Lucan (6, 320), and Juvenal (11, 715). The word seems to refer in a general way to poets later than Vergil. 6, 320 *lividum* (*invidum*) is said to be found only *apud neotericos*, though it occurs with the same meaning in Cic., and Hor. 6, 167 *si . . . per se plenum, sicut et O, quamquam neoterici haec iungant et pro uno ponant: Persius (2, 10) O si ebulliat patruus, praeclarum funus. O si. Horace uses the words together in the Satires 2, 6, 8 and 10. 10, 192 canentem senectam pro albo colore neoterice dictum. 10, 418 canentia lumina has no special comment. 11, 590 sagittam ultricem is called *neotericum*. 11, 715 *vanos stultos posteriores dicere coeperunt, inde tractum est in neotericis: Iuvenalis (3, 159). The long comment added by the Schol. Dan., and also 1, 393, makes the word mean mendax. 12, 605 is given a note by Probus: neotericum erat flavos.**

IV.—THE ORIGIN OF THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE.

1. The origin of the gerund and gerundive, in spite of all the attempts of scholars, can hardly yet be considered satisfactorily elucidated.

In the American Journal of Philology, vol. IX, 2 and 4 (1888), Mr. S. B. Platner set forth clearly and in detail the statistics of the use of the gerund and gerundive in Pliny's Letters and in Tacitus' Annals, and more recently, in vol. XIV, 4 (Dec. 1893), he has done the same for Plautus and Terence. The latter is the more important for us, as the language was nearer the primitive form in the time of Plautus and Terence. The result of his analysis shows that in Early Latin the gerund is more frequently used than the gerundive. "Exactly the opposite," he says, "was found to be the case in Silver Latin, as was to be expected, especially if it is assumed that the latter is a development from the former." Of this more hereafter. Mr. Platner, however, is concerned with the *uses*, not the *origin* of the gerund and gerundive.

As regards the origin:—Brugmann in the Grundriss, II, §69 (1889), derived the *-ndo-* from *-tno-*, comparing the Lithuanian verbals in *-tinas* (see A. J. P. VIII 441-7). Professor Conway (Class. Rev. V, p. 297, July, 1891) showed the weak points in this comparison, and Brugmann (Gr. II, §1103, 3, 1892) has withdrawn his former conjecture, at the same time adding that he is unable to accept Conway's own conjecture (Cl. Rev. V 296 sqq.) (which is itself only a repetition of Curtius' view given in the second edition of his Greek Etymology, p. 590) or those put forward by Thurneysen (*-mn-* in Latin—Die Bildung des ital. Gerundivums—Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 493 ff.) and Mr. Dunn (Cl. Rev. VI 1 sqq.). He then proceeds in a long 'Remark' to give a new theory of his own which in some respects is excellent.

He says that the inquiries of Weisweiler have rendered it highly probable that the meaning of 'deed to be accomplished' belonged to the gerundive from the beginning, and further, that the gerund (which does not appear in the Umbr.-Samn. monu-

ments) was first developed from the gerundive when, e. g., to *virtus colenda est* was formed *colendum est*, as 'modus impersonalis.' The fact that in Early Latin the gerund is more frequently employed than the gerundive proves nothing against this, for the gerund arose to fill the gap created by the loss in Latin of the Prim. Ital. infin. in *-m*, which still survived in Umbrian and Oscan—that is, it arose in Latin as an abstract noun, and as such was naturally in frequent use. Further, says Brugmann, as the other Indo-Germanic languages, so far as one has yet been able to see, offer nothing wherewith to connect the suffixal ending of the Italic gerundive, it is *a priori* credible that this developed itself on Italic soil, on the ground of the final infinitive, just as German 'der zu lobende, ein zu lobender' on the ground of 'zu loben,' Skr. *grāvāy-iyas* 'laudandus' on the ground of the infinitive **grāvāi*. On this he bases his new conjecture.

He starts with the Primitive Ital. accus. infin. in *-m*, e. g. Umbr. *fašiu(m)*, *fero(m)*. This, he says, was combined with the postposition **dō* or **de* (for which he compares Latin *en-do indu*, *dō-nicum dō-nec*, Avestic *vaēsman-da* 'to the house, home,' Greek *ἡμέτερον-δε* and *ἡμέτερον δῶ*), with the meaning of the German 'zu with the infinitive.' *-md-* must have already in Primitive Italic become *-nd-* (cf. Old Latin *quan-de*, Umbr. *pane* (= 'quam'), etc., Grundriss, I 207),¹ and thus the combination with the postposition acquired an isolated place compared with the other infin. in *-m*.

Lastly, adjectives of the *o*-declension were made to the forms in *-dō* or *-de*; just as the adjectives *subingu-s*, *antenovissimu-s*, *perfidu-s* arose to *sub iugō*, *ante novissimum*, *per fidem*.

Brugmann gives two alternative theories to explain the forms such as *plendu-s videndu-s flandu-s arandu-s*:—(1) They may come from a primitive form **plē-m* **vidē-m* **flā-m* **arā-m* in the sense of *plēre*, *vidēre*, etc.; cf. the Avestic *dam* 'to place, give' (Grundriss, II, §1089, 1), in which case *plendu-s arandu-s* Osc.

¹ *-nd-* is, as a general rule, the form shown by inscriptions, but the Lex Iulia Municipalis (B. C. 44), C. I. L. I 206, presents nine instances of the gerundive spelt with *-md-*, viz. *damdam*, *damdam*, *tuendam*, *tuendarum*, *faciundei*, beside thirty-two spelt with *-nd-*, e. g. *tuendam*. These nine instances show the earlier form of the gerundive according to Brugmann's theory and my own (v. infra), but as I cannot find any other instance of the gerund or gerundive so spelt in the C. I. L., it seems improbable that any etymological value should be attached to the *-md-* in these nine instances.

úpsannam would contain these older infinitive forms unchanged. For Latin *rotundu-s*, *rubicundu-s* we must then assume the infin. **rotō-m* **rubicō-m* (cf. *aegrō-tu-s*); *rotundu-s* for **rotondo-s* as *latrunculus* for **latron-culu-s*; *ferendo-s* arose in Pr. Ital. from **ferondo-s* (*ferundu-s*) beside present participle *ferent-*, on analogy of *arandu-s* *videndu-s* beside the present participle *arant- vident-*. Or (2) possibly Osc. *fatium*, *censaum*, Umbr. *stiplo(m)* (for **stiplā-om*) 'stipulari' came from Primitive Italic **-ē-īom* **-ā-īom* (cf. I s. pres. in **-ē-īō* **-ā-īō*), and corresponding to these there had existed *-ē(ī)on-do-*, *-ā(ī)on-do-* (cf. Latin *faciundu-s* to Umbr. *fašiu(m)* 'facere'). The relation of **ferondo-* to the participial stem **feront-* (cf. *eunt-*, etc., §126) would have caused not only *ferendo-* on analogy of *ferent-*, but also *arando-videndo-* on analogy of *arant- vident-*. By this means we may explain *rotundu-s* *rubicundu-s* as proceeding regularly from **rotā(ī)ondo-* **rubicā(ī)ondo-* through the intermediate stage **rotōndo-* **rubicōndo-* (cf. I s. *rotō* for **rotā-(ī)ō*).

In contrast to *rotandu-s*, *rubicandu-s* they held fast the original form of the infin., since they had quite early become pure adjectives.

Of these two views, Brugmann prefers the second.

2. Brugmann is probably right in thus starting from Prim. Italic to explain the gerund and gerundive, and I would follow him thus far in starting with Prim. Italic accus. infin. in *-m*, e. g. Umbr. *fero(m)*, *fašiu(m)*, as basis; but his theory of explanation by means of the postposition **dō* or **de* seems to me very unlikely. Postposition undoubtedly occurs frequently in Umbr. Samnite, e. g. Umbr. *manuv-e* 'in manu,' *ebetraf-e* 'ad exitus,' Oscan *húrtín* for *hortei* (locative) or *hortoi* (dative) + *en* (Bréal); cf. Latin *tecum*, *quem ad* beside *ad quem*.

Brugmann (in Grundriss, II, §162, rem. 2¹) explains the Latin² passive infin. in *-ier* also by postposition: he conjectures that *-er* represents the preposition *ar* (*arbiter ar-vorsus*), which appears to be of dialectic origin (I, §369, rem. 1). For the change of *-ar* to *-er* see I, §97, 3, and he compares *in-ers arti-fex im-ertiō*; and for the position of the word he compares *quem ad* beside

¹ Cf. also Grundr. II, §1094, 3.

² Deecke, reading *doivom atoier pactia(nt)* 'sacrum agi vovent' in the Marsian inscr. (Zvetaieff No. 45), explains *atoier* as infin. passive = **actu-ier* 'agi.' If Deecke is right, this pass. infin. in *-ier* is not confined to Latin.

ad quem and Umbr. *asam-ař* 'ad aram.' He continues that it need not surprise us to find at so early a stage of Latin, the combination of the infinitive with a preposition which is established in the Romance languages (cf. *ad* before the infinitive, as Ital. *ho a scrivere*¹), since even in Latin the infinitive had again approximated to the noun, and at least *inter* and *praeter* were used with it, e. g. *nūl praeter plōrāre* (Hor.).² But this theory has not met with general acceptance; Stolz (Latin Grammar, p. 380) gives a more plausible theory to explain these forms.³

It is true that the infinitive was originally an abstract substantive, and as such presumably might have a preposition postfixed to it; but if so, it can only have taken place in Prim. Italic before the infinitive lost its original use as a substantive pure and simple, and must have died out very soon, for otherwise we should expect to find at least some trace of it on inscriptions; but there is none such whatever to warrant the assumption that it ever took place. Thus it seems that there is nothing which can bear out Brugmann's theory of postposition in the explanation of (1) the pass. infin. in *-ier*; (2) the gerundive.

Assuming, however, that the gerundive be rightly thus explained, let us see what it can mean. It can hardly mean more than 'to the doing' (cf. English 'to do'); it could not *originally* be passive, 'deed to be done,' the meaning which Brugmann would give to it. It might of course gradually shade into such a passive meaning (cf. *facile dictu* 'easy to say' is much the same as 'easy to be said'), but it cannot have had it originally.

Nor, again, does the German 'der zu lobende, ein zu lobender' seem to me to be a good parallel. It is true that there is a preposition in the composition of these German phrases, but the second part is a *bona fide* present participle active, whereas that can hardly be said of the Italic gerundive.

It may also be mentioned, by the way, that the derivation given

¹ To quote from an author: "Il suocero, che ben sapeva d'averla a dare, tutta l'aveva provista," 'The father-in-law, who well understood to have to give it, had provided it altogether.' Fortini, Nov. II, p. 287, in *Novelle di Autori Fiorentini e Senesi* (Torino, 1853). This is a good example, showing two infinitives governed by different prepositions.

² Compare also *hic vereri* (= *verecundiam*) *perdidit*, Plaut. Bacch. I, 2, 50, and *nostrum istud vivere triste*, Persius, I 9.

³ F. Müller (Grundr. der Sprachwiss. III 2, 650 f.) explains *-er* in these forms as the passive exponent, and Brugmann (Gr. II, §1094, 3, rem.) compares Osc. *vincer* 'vincitur,' karanter 'pascunter.'

of ἡμέτερον δῶ (v. Fick, Verg. Wörterbuch der Idg. Sprachen, I, p. 458) is hardly likely to receive much favour¹; for other explanations of it *vide* Brugmann, Gr. II, §223, rem. 3 (Engl. ed., vol. III, p. 102).

3. I would venture to suggest another theory for the origin of the gerundive and gerund, based, as Brugmann's, on the Prim. Ital. infinitive in *-m*, e. g. (to take a different word) the Oscan infin. *edum* 'eating' or 'to eat.' To this infinitive² as basis was added the suffix *-do*, which appears in adjectives such as *imbridu-s*, *lucidu-s* (for which cf. Osthoff, Verb. in der Nominal-comp. 121 ff.; Thurneysen, Ueber die Herkunft und Bildung der lat. Verba auf *-io*, 1879, p. 13; and Corssen, Krit. Beitr., pp. 97-9. Cf. also Brugmann, Gr. II, §128). This suffix *-do* may, so far as Latin alone is concerned, represent either Idg. $\sqrt{dō}$ - 'give' or possibly $\sqrt{dhē}$ - 'place,' or rather 'make,' since the Idg. $\sqrt{dhē}$ had lost its meaning 'place' in Italic, and retained only that of 'to make.'

Thielmann (Das Verbum *dare* im Lateinischen, Leipzig, 1882) gives reasons to support the theory that often in Latin we find *dare* used with the sense of $\sqrt{dhē}$ - instead of with that of $\sqrt{dō}$ -. Cf. Dr. Postgate, Transactions of the Philological Society, 1880-81, p. 99 f., where he suggests that there was a pair of roots in Indo-Germanic, *da-* and *dha-*, with much the same meaning, and that in some languages the two roots were preserved with differentiated meaning (e. g. Greek and Sanskrit), and in other languages (e. g. Latin and Avestic) one was lost and the survivor had to do duty for both. Cf. also his remarks in the Academy, 1882, No. 552, p. 400. Brugmann, Litterarisches Centralblatt, 1882, No. 41, col. 1390, objects that Idg. *dh* at the beginning of a word becomes *f* (as in *felare*, *fumus*), and not *d*; from $\sqrt{dhē}$ - in all probability come *faber* and *facio*, hence we should expect **fare* *τιθέναι* beside *dare* *διδόναι*. But in the Grundriss, I, §370, 1888, he shows that in the middle of a word in some cases we find Idg. *dh* represented in Latin by *d*; instances are *mediu-s*:

¹ Streitberg, in his recent essay, Idg. Forsch., vol. III, p. 331, fairly disproves this explanation of δῶ. One of his objections is that the circumflex is thus left quite unexplained.

² That the infinitive in *-m* should be thus used as a substantive need not surprise us, if we consider its origin; we may well compare the Skr. infinitives made from the root-noun, and from the noun in *tu*, which, amongst other uses, we find in the accusative as object of a verb, e. g. *śak-* 'be able,' *dhṛ-* 'undertake,' *arh-* 'be worthy, have the right,' *vid-* 'know' (v. Whitney, Skr. Gr., §981).

Skr. *mādhya-s*, Gk. Hom. μέσσο-*s* from *μεθιο-*s*, Pr. Idg. *medh₂io-; *aedēs aedilis*: Skr. *ēdha-s*, Gk. αἶθ-ω from √ *aidh-* 'glow'; *vidua*: Skr. *vidhāvā*; *fidō*: Gk. πείθω, gf. *bhē₂idhō from √ *bhe₂idh*, and *con-dō* from *con-dh-ō, *con-ditu-s*¹ beside *fa-c-iō* from √ *dhē-* 'place,' hence it is possible that **dare* = '(place), make' originally arose from compounds such as *con-dō*; at any rate, Brugmann's criticism would not affect the suffix -*do*, for the *d* here would come in the middle of the compounded word, just as it does in *con-dō*.²

In SANSKRIT we find the two roots used almost synonymously in e. g.

<i>artha-da-s</i>	'bringing benefit, generous,'
<i>gara-da-s</i>	'giving poison,'
<i>garbha-da-s</i>	} (Vedic) 'causing or giving a birth, impregnating,'
and	
<i>garbha-dhā-s</i>	
<i>jala-da-s</i>	'giving water,'
<i>māna-da-s</i>	'giving self-respect, pride-giving,'
<i>a-doma-dā-s</i>	} (both Vedic) 'causing no pain.'
and	
<i>a-doma-dhā-s</i>	

From the Rig-Veda alone we have—

compounds with *dā-*:

jani-dā-
sahasra-dā
vāja-dā-
dhana-dā-
ātma-dā-
hiraṇya-dā-
vastra-dā-
bala-dā-
aṣva-dā-
anaṣva-dā-
vasu-dā-
go-dā-
ojo-dā-
etc., etc.

compounds with *dhā-*:

jani-dhā- (of uncertain meaning)
sahasra-dhā-
ratna-dhā-
apa-dhā-
nāma-dhā-
sarva-dhā-
madhu-dhā-
vīpo-dhā-
vayo-dhā-
varivo-dhā-
dhiyaṃ-dhā- (quoted above)
etc., etc.

¹ The compounds of √ *dhē-* and √ *dō-* were confused in Latin, beginning with the 1st and 2d plural, -*dī-* = (1) *-*fa-* *-*dh-*-, (2) *-*da-* *-*d-*- (v. Brugmann, Gr. II, §505, rem. 2).

² Brugmann (Gr. II, §688) assigns to the √ *dō-*, besides the meaning 'give,' also a similar meaning to √ *dhē-*.

Of the former Grassmann gives twenty-four instances in all, of the latter sixteen. We should especially note the last example quoted, *dhiyam-dhā* 'thought-directing,' for in this compound the first member is still seen in the accusative case governed by the root *dhā*.

In LATIN it is very common, especially from verbs of the *e*-conjugation; e. g. *rubi-du-s*, *ari-du-s* *umi-du-s* *liqui-du-s* *madi-du-s*, *algi-du-s* *cali-du-s* (and *caldu-s*) *torri-du-s* *frigi-du-s* *tepi-du-s* *fervi-du-s*, *niti-du-s* *splendi-du-s* *fulgi-du-s* *candi-du-s* *albi-du-s*, *timi-du-s* *pavi-du-s*,¹ beside which we must compare the substantives ending in *-ē-do*, e. g.

rubē-do albē-do frigē-do

From a verb of the *i*-conjugation we have

cupi-du-s beside *cupī-do* (and *cupē-do*) and Old Latin *cupi-re*

From verbs whose stems end in *-i* in the present:

sapi-du-s in-sipi-du-s beside *sapi-ō*
rapi-du-s beside *rapi-ō*

From verbs of consonant conjugation:

vivi-du-s
flui-du-s

Also from nominal stems:

herbi-du-s from *herba*
morbi-du-s " *morbo-*
imbri-du-s " *imbri-*
geli-du-s " *gelu*

For instance of the later loss of the *i*, cf. e. g.

<i>caldu-s</i> (mentioned above)	beside	<i>cali-du-s</i>
<i>valde</i>	"	<i>vali-du-s</i>
<i>soldus</i>	"	<i>solī-du-s</i>
<i>ardus</i> (Lucil.)	"	<i>āri-du-s</i>

¹These adjectives are, I believe, usually derived from the substantives in *-es*, where such exist beside them, e. g. *frigus*, *liquor*. In support of this derivation for the adjectives, the dative-ablative in *-ibus* is generally quoted. J. Schmidt explained *-ibus* as coming from **-ez-bhos*, but Thurneysen (Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 489) opposed this theory, and Brugmann (Gr. II, §397, rem. 2) supports him emphatically in his opposition.

In all these instances (pace Victor Henry, who condemns this view as "peu vraisemblable," *Précis de Gramm. comparée du Grec et du Latin*, §163 (3)) the suffix *-do-* means 'giving,' or perhaps 'causing,' e. g. 'giving forth redness, heat, dampness, moisture, coolness, warmth,' etc.¹

In GREEK this suffix is hardly to be found,² but Greek uses the suffix *-φόρος* (from the verb *φέρω*) in an exactly parallel way:

ἀστραπή-φόρος	beside Latin <i>fulgi-du-s</i>
φωσ-φόρος	" { <i>luci-du-s</i>
	" { <i>luci-fer</i>
ὀμβρο-φόρος	" { <i>imbri-fer</i>
	" { <i>imbri-du-s</i>
κερασ-φόρος } κερο-φόρος }	" { <i>corni-fer</i>
	" { <i>corni-ger</i> (cf. perhaps Greek κόρυ-δο-s, supra).

¹ Vide infra on Umbr. *kaleřuf*.

² Although the suffixes *-dho-* and *-do-* are not frequent in forming Greek nouns like Lat. *rubidus*, etc., yet we often find the *-dh-* and *-d-* used otherwise, e. g. the *dh-* suffix in forms like βρῦ-θω πλῆ-θω φλεγέ-θω has often been referred to *√dhē-* 'place,' and likewise the *d-* suffix in certain cases was considered as from the *√dō-*, which (according to Brugmann, II, §688), beside the meaning 'give,' had also a like meaning to *√dhē-*. (On these suffixes see especially Brugmann, Gr. II, §§694, 695.) We may perhaps see the *√dhē-* in the *-dhi*, which is a method of forming the 2 s. imperat. act. in Aryan Greek and Baltic-Slavonic, e. g. Skr. *viddhi*, Gk. *ισθι*, Old Lith. *veisdi*, from **uid-dhi* from *√uid-*; Gk. *ὀρνυ-θι* beside *ὀρ-νῦ*, Skr. *g-ṇu*, to *ὀρνῦμι* 'I stir'; Skr. *g-ṇu-dhi* and *g-ṇu-hi* beside *g-ṇu* to 3 s. indic. *g-ṇō-ti* 'hears.' *-dhi*: *-hi* = *-dhita*: *hita*. This *-dhi* became so crystallized in this use that it was even added to form the imperative of its own root *dhē-*, e. g. Skr. *dhēhi* from Pr. Aryan **dha-s-dhi*. The literal meaning would then be 'make the knowing, the stirring, the hearing,' etc. The *i* of *-dhi* may be due to the analogy of *-si*, the Idg. personal ending of 2 s. pres. indic. act., especially as indicative forms were used (along with others) as imperative, e. g. Skr. 2 s. *vē-ji* 'come hither,' *kṣē-ji* 'delay,' *sdi-si* 'seat thyself,' *prā-si* 'fill,' Gk. *λέξαι* from **λεκ-σ-σαι* 'lay thyself' (cf. Brugmann, Gr. II, §§956, 969, 2). (On this *i* in *-mi*, *-si*, *-ti*, *-nti*, as contrasted with *-m*, *-s*, *-t*, *-nt*, cf. Brugmann, Gr. II, §973, who there regards it as possibly a particle indicating present time, and §463, 1, where he regards it as probably a demonstrative particle.) This explanation of *-dhi* is supported by the fact that Brugmann sees *√dhē-* also in the Aryan dat. infin. in *-dhiāi*, e. g. Skr. *vāha-dhyāi*, Av. *vasaiḍyāi* 'to drive, carry,' beside which are found in like function *-dhēyāya* *-dhāi* *-dhē* (v. Grundr. II, §§1088, 9, 1089, 12), and in Greek mid. pass. infin. in *-σθαι*, which seems to have originated with words like *εἶδεσθαι*, which were wrongly analysed as *εἶδε-σθαι* beside *εἶδε-ται* (v. Grundr. II, §1093, 8).

νυκτι-φόρος	beside Latin <i>nocti-fer</i> 'the evening star'
ὀδυνη-φόρος	" <i>morbi-du-s</i>
ξιφη-φόρος	" { <i>ensi-fer</i>
ξιφο-φόρος	
σελασ-φόρος	" <i>splendi-du-s</i>
ἀνθεσ-φόρος	" <i>flori-du-s</i>
σαπρο-φόρος	" { <i>feti-du-s</i>
	<i>puti-du-s</i> ¹

From these examples it seems clear that nothing prevents the suffix *-do-* from being derived from a verbal root, either $\sqrt{d\bar{o}-}$ or $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}-}$, or both. On the whole, I decide in favour of $\sqrt{d\bar{o}-}$ rather than of $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}-}$, because, although *dh* could become *d* in Latin (see above), yet it can hardly have become anything except *f* in Umbr.-Osc.,² and so we should have to regard the gerundive as borrowed by Umbr.-Osc. from Latin, if we were to determine *dh-* as the primitive ground-form.³ Moreover, on account of Umbr. *kaleřuf*, *calersu* = 'calidos' or 'callidos' where *řrs* is the result of *d* (not *dh*) between vowels, it is more probable that we should trace $\sqrt{d\bar{o}-}$ than $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}-}$ in the Latin adjectives in *-du-s* (given above). My view, then, is that to form the gerundive this suffix *-do-* was added in Pr. Ital. to the Pr. Ital. infinitive (a substantive) in *-m*, and governed the infinitive as its object. This explanation, moreover, receives much support from the fact that in the case of "Gerundives used in a passive sense in the predicate, after certain verbs, to denote the object of their action" (Mr. Platner in A. J. P. XIV 4, 1893), *dare* is by far the most frequent verb, e. g.

Dato excrucandum me. Plaut. Mil. 567.

Te elinguendam dederō. Id. Aul. 250.

Statuam faciundam dare. Id. Curc. 440.

Anulum utendum dederat. Id. 603.

"It will be seen," says the writer, "that this usage is almost a stereotyped formula, and that in Plautus, in two-thirds of all the

¹ I do not imply by these comparisons that *every one* of the Latin instances shews clearly a nominal form before *-do-*, and so far they are not *all* strictly parallel to the Greek.

² Oscan *aīdīl* 'aedilis' from $\sqrt{aīdh-}$ 'glow' was a Latin loan-word (Brugmann, Gr. I, §370).

³ Mr. Dunn (Class. Rev. VI, p. 3) was unable to decide between $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}-}$ and $\sqrt{d\bar{o}-}$ as the origin of *-do-s*. The Umbr.-Samn. forms (unless borrowed) will admit only of the latter.

cases of its occurrence, it is with the verb *dare*, and in four more with *locare*. In Terence the proportion is somewhat less, but the inference seems warranted that the ordinary earliest use was with *dare*, and one or two verbs like *locare* and *conducere*, and that its use with other verbs like *petere* and *rogare* was the result of analogy and a somewhat later development."

We find exactly the same use of *dare* in Osc. *trífbúm ekak ... úpsannam deded* 'domum hanc ... operandam dedit' (Zvetaieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. Dial., No. 143; cf. also Nos. 96, 97, 145).

The close connection here visible between *dare* and the gerundive seems to support my theory.

4. There is no real objection to my theory that the *-do-* governs a case here, for compare e. g.

In SANSKRIT, especially in Vedic, where we might expect to find compounds in the primitive stage of formation (i. e. that of a syntactical combination), such compounds as

Vedic	{	<i>dhiyamdha</i> 'thought-directing' (quoted above)
		<i>dhiyamjinva</i> 'thought-furthering'
		<i>dhanamjayá</i> 'wealth-winning'
		<i>puramdará</i> 'city-destroying'
		<i>abhayamkará</i> 'causing absence of danger'
		<i>samudramīṅkhaya</i> 'sea-exciting'
		<i>puṣṭimbhará</i> 'prosperity-bringing'
		<i>vājambará</i> 'booty-winning'
		<i>arimḍama</i> 'foe-taming'
		<i>viṣvambhará</i> 'all-supporting'
		<i>vācamīṅkhayá</i> 'voice-inciting'
		<i>abhramliha</i> 'cloud-licking'
		<i>paramtapa</i> 'foe-vexing.'

Add also (for the accusative is often found in Skr. as object of verbs of 'going' and the like, which in the related languages are not transitive,¹ e. g. *divaṁ yayuḥ* 'they went to heaven'; cf. Whitney, Skr. Gr. §274 a):

<i>patamgá</i> (Vedic) 'going to flight, flying'
<i>hrdayamgama</i> 'heart-touching'
<i>sāgaramgama</i> 'sea-going.'

¹ Cf. in Italic the accus. of the supine used after verbs of motion, e. g. Lat. *datum eo*, Umbr. *aserialo cest* 'observatum ibit' (whence arose the so-called fut. infin. pass. *datum iri*); the same use of the accus. in *-tu-m* we find also in Skr. and Balto-Slavonic.

In all these compounds the first member is an accusative case governed by a root-stem or a derivative in *a* of equivalent meaning. Cf. Whitney, *Skr. Gr.* §§1250 *a*, 1269 *b*, 1270 *c*.

Similarly

AVESTIC: *ahūmer^{nc}* (*ahūm*, acc. of *ahu* 'world,' governed by root *marec*) 'world-destroying' beside *ahu-mer^c*.¹

māthremperesa (*māthrem*, acc. of *māthra* 'word, holy writ,' governed by root *pares* = *Skr. prach-* 'ask') 'one who has studied the Avesta.'

vīreñjan (from *vīrem*, acc. of *vīra* 'man,' governed by root *jan*) 'man-slaying,' beside *vīra-jan-*, *Skr. vīra-hān-*.

drujemvana (from *drujem*, acc. of *druj*, name of some female demons, governed by root *van* 'conquer') 'female-demon-conquering.'

viṣpā-hiṣant- (acc. pl. neuter of *viṣpa-*) 'able to do everything.'

ARMENIAN: *meḷs-a-sēr* 'loving sins,' *meḷs*, acc. pl. of *meḷ-* (for this *-a-*, the vowel of composition, v. Brugmann, *Gr. II*, §28, 1).

stin-di 'sucking the breast, suckling' (*stin*, gen. *stean* 'woman's breast') may possibly be an instance in point (v. Brugmann, *ibid.*, rem. 2).

GREEK: *δικασπόλος* from **δικανς-πολος*.

μογος-τόκος from **μογονς-τοκος*.

νουν-εχόντως and *νουν-έχης* as if from a verb *νουνέχω*.

From *ἀταλὰ φρονέων*, *ἀταλα-φρονέων*, we get *ἀταλάφρων*.

πυρ-φόρος beside *πυροφόρος*.

ἀμφορεᾶ-φόρος.

ποδα-νιπτήρ, *ποδά-νιπτρον*, beside *χέρνιψ* and *χερόνιπτρον*.

μῦσ-φόνος beside *μυοφόνος*.

βιβλία-γραφος (*Cratin. Χειρ.* 18; but v. Lob. *Phryn.* 655) beside *βιβλιόγραφος*.

βιβλια-φόρος beside *βιβλιόφορος*.

παν-όπτης beside *παντόπτης*.

ὀνομα-θέτης (but Lob. *Phryn.* 688 corrects to *ὀνοματο-θέτης*). Cf.

ὀνομακλήδην, *ὀνομακλήτωρ* (late), *nomenclator* below, and *ὀνομάκλυτος*, on which vide Victor Henry, *Préc. de Gram. Comp.*, §176.

φωσ-φόρος beside *φαιεσφόρος* and *φωτοφόρος*.

¹ One *m* is dropped in *ahūmer^{nc}* for **ahūmmer^{nc}*; Avestic allows no double consonants, v. Jackson's *Av. Gr.*, part II, §186. Brugmann is therefore wrong in writing it with double *m*, in *Grundriss*, II, §§27 and 163.

κερασ-φόρος beside κεροφόρος.

κωλα-κρέτης, the form given by Photius and Suidas, is sometimes derived from κῶλα (acc. pl. of κῶλον) and κείρω. The Schol. Aristoph. and Timae. quote the form with a γ, κωλα-γρέτης, which is supposed to come from ἀγείρω.

χοα-χυτής is quoted by one German writer, but Hesychius does not know the form, and Liddell and Scott omit it.

καρη-κομόωντες 'long-haired,' from κάρη and κομάω; cf. the phrase τὰς κεφαλὰς κομῶσαι used of the women of a certain Libyan tribe in Hdt. IV 168.

In some, however, of these (e. g. μῦσ-φόνος) the first member is explained by others as the stem, and not the accusative case (cf. Brugmann, Gr. II, §29), but there is not much argument either way; the existence of the forms μυσοφόνος κεροφόρος, etc., beside μῦσφόνος κερασφόρος seems to favor my explanation of these latter forms. (For instances of other cases which are perhaps more commonly used, cf. ἀλοσάχνη Διόδοτος πυλουργὴς δορίληπτος.) On these compounds generally, vide G. Meyer, C. St. 6, 382 ff., and Clemm, C. St. 7, 95 f.

ITALIC:

Latin: *vindex* from **vim-dex* 'one who shows the violence,' i. e. 'the avenger' (Schweizer-Sidler, Latin Gr.², explain this as from **vēnundex* 'one who shows the penalty-price'; but if so, why is it not *vendex*, like *vendo*?).

*iudex*¹ from **iouz-dic-s* 'one who shows the law,' i. e. 'the judge' (cf. Avestic *yaoždath-* infra), beside *iuridicus*.

iu(s)-stitium.

Oscan: *meddeiξ*¹ from **medos* (= Umbr. *meřs*)—*deix*, **medos* becoming in Oscan by syncope **meds*, and the voiced *s* falling out before *d* (cf. *nīdus* from **nī-zd-o-s*).

Latin: *nomenclator*. Here *nomen* may be accusative case governed by the second member of the compound. Cf. Gk. *ὄνομα-θέτης*, supra, and *ὄνομα-κλυτος* (Brugmann, Gr. II, §§12, 29, takes it as the stem, -*en-* being simply from -*η-*).

domuitio from **domum-itio*² may be compared with Sanskrit *sāgarāṃgama* above.

¹*iudex* and *meddeiξ* might of course be explained as containing the stem and not an accusative case, but *vindex* seems to favour the explanation which I have given.

²Cf. the periphrastic fut. infin. pass., e. g. *datum iri*, where fusion of the two words is attested in the writing -*tuiri* for -*tum iri* (vide Brandt, Arch. f. lat. Lexikogr. II 349 ff.; Schmalz, Fleckeisen's Jahrb. 1892, p. 79 f.).

mus-cipula 'a mouse-trap.' Is *mus* perhaps a fossilized acc. plural formed on analogy of the *u*-stems, e. g. *manūs* (cf. Gk. *μῦας μῦς*, a reformat following *ὀφρῦας ὀφρῦς*)? Compare, beside it, *muricidus*.

Lariscolus = probably 'is qui Lares colit' (cf. Skutsch, De nominum Lat. compositione), beside which compare *Larifuga*.

legiscrepa, νομοδίφας gloss Philox. (Forcellini presumably regards this as a mistake of the scribe for *legicrepa*, which is the form which he quotes); compare *legirupa*.

forasgerones, cf. Forcellini, s. v. *foras*, nota. 2) Item *foras* usurpatum tanquam nomen reperitur apud Aggen. de contr. agr., p. 53, Goës. 3) Per hyphen composuit Plaut. Truc. 2. 7. 1, *foras-gerones*. *foras* is probably an accus. plur., of which perhaps *foris* was the ablative, from an obsolete noun *fora* = Skr. *dvār*, Gk. *θύρα*. (Brugmann, Gr. II, §358, suggests that *forās* 'outside, out of doors' may be a loc. plur., but says that *forās* 'out, outwards' is accusative.)

We may add also here two Plautine comic names:

Argentumexterebronides, Plaut. Pers. 4. 6. 21 (but Forcellini prefers to read *argentiexterebronides* or *argenti exterebronides*), beside *argentifodina* 'a silver-mine.'

Quodsemelarrripides, id. 4. 6. 22, from *quod semel* + *arripio*, = 'is qui aliquid semel arripit.'

┌ *Kalendae* 'The Calends'; *kalandae*, found e. g. in CIL. 5. 1682, 9. 1095, 10. 539, is perhaps the original form; it may be derived (just as I would derive the gerundive) from Pr. Ital. infin. **kalām* or **kalāom* (✓ *kal-*, cf. Gk. *καλέω*, Lat. *calō* of the 1st conjugation) + the suffix *-do* 'giving the proclamation.' Compare Varro, L. L. 6, §27, Müll.: *primi dies nominati kalendae*, ab eo quod his diebus calantur eius mensis nonae a pontificibus, quintanae an septimanae sint futurae. It is fem. plur., in agreement with *dies* understood. The *e* of *kalendae* is difficult: perhaps *calo* may have been of the 3d conj. as well as of the 1st in very early Latin; cf. *lavo*, *iuvo*, which are of both 1st and 3d conjugation. Compare also *ē-legāns* beside *ē-ligere*.¹ This view

¹ Compare also Umbr. *portust* 'portaverit' beside *portatu* 'portato,' Osc. *upsed* 'operatus est,' *uupsens* *οὐπσενσ* 'operaverunt,' etc., which Brugmann (Gr. II, §874) explains as probably built on the model of the primary *ā*-verbs with strong perfect (like Lat. *iuvāre iūvi*), which he supposes Umbr.-Osc., like

is supported by the Umbrian forms *kařetu kařitu car-situ* = 'calato, vocato' (*l* having become *d*, whence ř *rs*), on which Bücheler, *Umbr.*, p. 50, says: "*carsitu* discedit paulum a *calato*, magis congruit cum *calendis*."

LITHUANIAN: *gera-dėjis* 'benefactor' (cf. Lat. *benefactor*, *benefacio*, infra) and

visa-galįs (beside *vis-galįs*) 'all-powerful'; perhaps contain an accusative neuter governed by the second member (cf. Brugm., Gr. II, §46).

This kind of composition, wherein the first member is an accusative case governed by the second member, perhaps first took place in compounds with the finite verb, and was extended thence, e. g.

Latin crēdō (with Pr. Idg. √ *dhē-*) corresponding to *Sanskrit* *ṣrad-dadhāmi* from Idg. **kred* + *dhe-dhē-mi*. That the two members of the compound have not yet in Sanskrit become fused into an inseparable unity may be seen by such passages as *ṣrād asmāi dhatta* 'put your trust in him' (RV. ii 12. 5). That the verb governs the dative in Sanskrit and Latin is the natural outcome of its original meaning 'I lay my heart to,' hence 'put my trust in, believe.' Cf. Plaut. Am. I. I 284 sqq. *iniurato, scio, plus credet mihi, quam iurato tibi*.

Avestic yaoždath- (from *yaoš* + *dath-*, a reduplicated form of root *dā-* 'to make') and *yaoždā-* (from *yaoš* and root *dā-* 'to make') = 'to purify,' where *yaoš* (= Sanskrit *yōṣ*, n., Latin *ius*, n., cf. *iudex* from **iouz-dic-s* above) is really an accusative governed by the verbal root *dā-* (which may represent either Idg. √ *dhē-* or √ *dō-*).

Skr. mṛdā-ti 'is gracious, pardons,' *mṛdikā*, n. 'grace, pardon,' *Avestic merždika*, n. 'grace, pardon,' the original form of which is probably an old syntactical combination **mṛg dō-* 'grant a purity (√ *merg-* 'wipe off') from sins'; *Skr. mṛṣ-ya-tē* 'forgets,' *marṣyatē* 'bears patiently, ex-

Latin, to have had at one time; the *ā*-denominatives may have possibly adopted their mode of flexion, just as in Late Latin we find (pple.) *probitus*, (imperat.) *probunto* from *probāre*. We may perhaps compare also the Latin verbs which have the *ā*-flexion when compounded, but some other when not, e. g. *oc-cupāre* beside *capio*, *as-pernāre* beside *spernō*, etc., which Brugmann (Gr. II, §583) explains as due to a difference in meaning, the *ā*-formations having an aoristic meaning, so that *occupāre* : *capio* = Gk. *μαρῆναι* : *μαίνουμαι*.

cuses, pardons,' *Lith. mirsz-ti* 'to forget,' which can equally well be regarded as being from an old **m̃s dō-* (by assimilation **m̃z dō-*) 'grant a forgetting, excuse' (Brugmann, Gr. I, §404, 1).

We may add

LATIN: *animum-adverto*, whence *animadverto*, from which arose *animadversio*.

bene-dico bene-facio male-dico male-facio (*bene* and *male* are very possibly primitive substantives in the accusative case which later became crystallized as adverbs; cf. beside *potis sum*, also *pote sum*, wherein *pote* is probably acc. sing. neut. for **poti*, crystallized already as adverb; we find also *bene sum* in the same way), whence *benedictio maledictio*.¹

sallo 'I salt,' from **sal-dō*.

nuncupō, perhaps from **nōmen-cupō* (for the latter half of the compound cf. *oc-cupō* : *capiō*); Brugmann, however (Gr. II, §34), derives it from **nōmi-cupō*; others, again, from **nōmine-cupō*.

palam-facio, if *palam perperam promiscam coram clam protinam multifariam*, etc., are really feminine accusatives from e. g. *perperus promiscus*, etc. (vide Osthoff, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIII 90 ff.). Brugmann, however (Gr. II, §276), seems inclined to regard them as instrumentals.

A compound verb formed from the Prim. Ital. infin. in *-m + √ dō-* seems to me to be found in *venundō* 'I sell.'

Of *venum* Forcellini says: "Quidam putant esse supinum verbi *veneo*; sed potius *veneo* est a *venum*, quasi *venum eo*. Aliquando

¹ Brugmann, Gr. II, §275, 1, regards *bene male* as instrumentals.

We shall do well to compare the corresponding word to *bene* in Germanic: O. Eng. *wele*, AS. *wela*, Dan. *vel*, Sw. *väl*, OHG. *wola*, MHG. *wol*, NHG. *wohl*, are all found used both as subst. and as adv. corresponding to Modern English *weal* and *well*. We find the word also compounded like *bene*: In Danish, for instance, the substantival use of *vel* is manifest in *velhavende* (adj.) 'wealthy, prosperous,' lit. 'weal-having'; *velgiøren velgiører* correspond to Lat. *benefacere bene-factor*; *vel* is a pure adverb in *velbekient* (adj.) 'well-known.' In Dutch *wei* by itself is found only as an adverb; but a trace of its original substantival use is visible in *weldoer* 'benefacere,' *weldoener* 'benefactor.' In Gothic, on the other hand, *vaila* is used solely as an adverb, e. g. *thu is sunus meins sa liuba, in thusai vaila galeikaida* 'thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased' (St. Mark, i. 11). Probably the adverbial use arose originally from compounded words, e. g. Latin *bene-dico*, pass. *bene-dictus*, whence *bene* came to be regarded as an adverb.

per casus inflexa legitur: itaque potius nomen esse dicendum est, cuius in usu frequentissimo est *venum*; dicimus autem *venum ire*, h. e. *vendi* 'to be exposed or set to sale,' *venum dare* aut *tradere*, h. e. *vendere* 'to sell, expose to sale.'" *Venum* may perhaps be better explained as an old Prim. Ital. infin. = 'sale.'

The word *venum* is, I believe, the only form found in classical Latin of the so-called substantive *venum*. It is not until we come down to Tacitus that we find the form *veno*, e. g. Tac. Ann. XIII 51, XIV 15, and it is only still later that we find the form *venui*, App. M. 8, p. 210; id. 8, p. 221, 29. That *veno* and *venui* arose may be due to a misunderstanding of the origin of the word, owing to its isolated position.

Perhaps *pessumdo* may be explained in the same way, as a relic of the Prim. Ital. infin.

Venum do, originally = 'I give as a selling or a sale,' *venum* being in apposition to the object of *do*, or it may be equally well explained 'I give a selling (i. e. the sale of) some object,' e. g. Si pater filium ter *venum* duuit (? or davit) filius a patre liber esto, Leg. XII Tab., 'If a father thrice gives his son as a sale' (or 'the selling his son'). Hence *venum do* became gradually regarded as a unity = 'sell.' We find it both uncompounded and also compounded as *venumdo* or (just like the gerundive forms) *venundo* (cf. *vendo*, an abbreviated form for *venum do*, and *veneo* for *venum eo* 'I come as a sale,' i. e. 'am on sale').

Is it possible to find the primitive nominal infinitive also in compounds such as Latin *arē-facio* 'I make a heating, make warm,' cf. also *concale-facio* *fervē-facio* *contabē-facio* *liquē-facio*, etc.? These may have been for **arē-facio* **concale-facio*, etc., in which the *e* was short because before a nasal + spirant (cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §612). The *m* may have become lost,¹ because

¹ For the loss of *-m-* in these compound verbs we may compare the history of the numerals ending in *-em*, when in composition. The very definiteness required of a numeral served to keep these in their original form till far into the historical period, but in many instances they too succumbed eventually to this process of weakening (analogy of other numerals perhaps tending to influence them), e. g.

decimodiae beside *decemmodiae*
septicollis
septiformis
septimestris beside *septemmemstris*
septipes
septiremis, etc.

in an unaccented syllable, e. g. *concale(m)-fácio* [cf. *homicida*, from *homin-* (the stem of *homo*) *-cida*, beside *homunculus*; cf. also *reccidi* from **rēc(e)cidi*, *opilio* from **ōv(i)pilio* (cf. Stolz, L. G.² §75)]. The variation, long *ē* beside *ē*, in these verbs may be due to 'compensatory lengthening' at the time of the loss of the *m*.¹ If this explanation of these verbs be right, we must suppose the origin to have been forgotten quite early, for we find in Cato: 'ferve bene facit'; Varro, R. R.: 'perferve ita fit,' 'excande me fecerunt'; Lucretius: 'facit are'; where there is no cause for loss of *m*, except perhaps in the second example from Varro, where *m* might have fallen out before the *m* in *me*.

The adjectives ending in *-ficus*, e. g. *arificus candificus languificus*, and those ending in *-dus*, e. g. *aridus candidus languidus*, etc. (given above), were formed on the model of the verbs when these latter had reached the forms in which they finally survived, e. g. *liquē-facio*; but owing to their losing all connection with the verbal system,² they went still further than the verbs, and changed their *e* to *i* (by rule cf. Brugmann, Gr. I, §65).³ [We may contrast herewith the Aryan adjectives formed directly from accusative case of a substantive, governed by the suffix, e. g. RV. *dhīyaṃ-dhā-* (accusative from *dhī* 'thought' and root *dhā-*) 'thought-directing,' *dhīyaṃ-jinva-* 'devotion-promoting,' Avest. *yaožda* = probably 'giving purity,' hence 'pure' (cf. Lat. *lucidus* 'giving brightness,' hence 'bright'), *yaoždāna* = 'purifying.']

The intermediate stage is perhaps traceable in *septejugis*, Inscr. Grut. 337. 8, and *septer[esmos]* on the Columna Rostrata, C. I. L. I 195. *Novem* in composition seems to have been saved from this weakening process through fear of confusion with the derivatives of *novus*.

Compare also *faenugraecum*, Cael. Aur. acut. III 3. 16, 8. 78, beside *faenum-graecum*, Cato, R. R. 27. 1. *malogranatum*, Hier., Vulg., Th. Prisc., beside *malum granatum*, apud Col. XII 42. 1; Pliny, XIII 90, al.; in this compound, however, there is perhaps an assimilation to *mālōbathron*—which is really a Greek word—beside Lat. *malicorium*.

¹ Ritschl, Opusc. II 618 sqq., lays down the rule that in the scenic poets the *e* is long in verbs with long penult, short in verbs with short penult.

² May we compare French *complément*, English *complement*, in which the inherent meaning of the verb is still manifest, beside French *compliment*, English *compliment* (cf. New Eng. Dict.)? Eng. *compliment* came in through the French at the end of the 17th century, *complément* direct from Latin a century earlier.

³ A new group of verbs arose, based on these adjectives in *-ficus*, e. g. *candifico candificus*, *expergifico expergificus*.

They were no doubt originally spelt with *e*; this is supported by Umbr. *kaleřuf*, *calersu*, 'calidos' or 'callidos' (quoted above). The inscriptional forms *soledus* C. I. L. I 1166, X 5807 (153-89 B. C.), *splendedissimus* C. I. L. XIV 4144 (147 A. D.) and XIV 474 (circa 200 A. D.), and *provedus* C. I. L. XII 2153 (quite late) can hardly be brought as evidence.

With these verbs, if my explanation be right, we may perhaps compare the Sanskrit periphrastic perfect, which was made in its earliest use by prefixing the accusative of a derivative abstract noun (in *-ām*)¹ to the perfect tense of the root *kr̥*- 'to make,' e. g. *gamayām cakāra* (AV.). This accusative of the abstract noun must have become quite fossilized to allow of its later composition with the perfects of the roots *as-* and *bhū-* 'to be'; in composition with the former of which it became practically a 'word-unity' like the O. C. Sl. imperfects *vidě-achū děla-achū*; for example, *sāntvayāmāsa* 'he hushed, soothed' (M. Bh. Nala x 3).

I should mention, however, that Brugmann (Gr. II, §896, rem.) regards all these forms—Latin, Sanskrit and O. C. Sl.—as instrumentals.

The primitive nominal infinitive we may probably find also in such expressions as *i-licet sci-licet vidē-licet* (which are not shortened forms from *i-re-licet*, etc.) = 'the going, the knowing, the seeing is lawful.'²

If Brugmann may adduce evidence from the ROMANCE languages to support his explanation of the Latin pass. infin. in *-ier* (v. supra), the same course is open here to me as well. In the Romance languages we find the future indic. formed by an infinitive governed as object by *habeo*, e. g. French *aimerai* (Old French *amerai*), Italian *amerò*, Spanish *amaré*, from Latin *amare habeo*; French *chanterai*, Italian *canterò*, Spanish *cantaré*, from Latin *cantare habeo*. We also find in Spanish and Provençal the two parts separated, and not yet fused into an inseparable unity (cf. Max Müller, Science of Lang., vol. I, p. 267), e. g. in Spanish, instead of *lo haré* 'I shall do it,' we find the more

¹ Delbrück, Altind. Synt. 426 f.

² This primitive infinitive is to be found also in the future infinitive in *-turum* (where, however, the infinitive is purely verbal, having lost its original nominal signification), e. g. *dicturum* from *dictū + erum* (= Umbr. *erom*, Osc. *ezum* 'to be'). This theory of Dr. Postgate (Cl. Rev. V 301) is accepted by Brugmann (Gr. II, §900).

primitive form *hacer lo he*, i. e. *facere id habeo*; and in Provençal *dir vos ai* instead of *je vous dirai*, *dir vos em* instead of *nous vous dirons*. *Habeo* governing an infin. as its object is not rare in Latin, e. g. Cic. pro Rosc. Amer., c. 35 *habeo etiam dicere, quem . . . de ponte in Tiberim deiecerit*; id. Epp. ad Att. II 22, 6, Epp. ad Fam. I 5; Varro, R. R. I 1, 2; Livy, XLIV, c. 22 *Illud affirmare pro certo habeo, audeoque*; Sil. I 16, 209 *Quare age, laetus habe nostros intrare penates* (v. l. *ave*); Valer. Flacc. I 1, 671; Tertull. de habitu mulier. I, Apolog., c. 37; Lact. IV 12, 15; 18, 22; 30, 2.

5. Having thus endeavoured to prove that there is no real objection to the theory that the suffix *-do-* governs the first element of the compound as an object, let us return to *edum*. We have thus *edum + do-*, whence *edundo-*, + nominative masculine suffix *s*, whence *edundus*, and the change of *-undus* to *-endus* would be on the analogy of the present participle *edens edent-*. This theory will (just as well as Brugmann's theory) suit Oscan and Umbrian quite well on phonetic grounds, for *-nd-* becomes *nn* in Oscan, e. g.

úpsannam 'operandam.'

sakrannas 'sacrandas,' Rh. M. 45, 1.

eehiianasúm, of uncertain meaning, Rh. M. 43, p. 557 f., I, with *n* instead of *nn*, as in Umbrian *pihaner* 'piandi.'

and *n* in Umbrian:

anferener 'circumferendi.'

pihaner 'piandi.'

Next as regards the *meaning* of the gerundive so derived. It may be asked why we have parallel forms such as

<i>timi-du-s</i>	<i>timen-du-s</i>
<i>horri-du-s</i>	<i>horren-du-s</i>
<i>tumi-du-s</i>	<i>tumen-du-s</i>
etc., etc.	

The answer to this objection is, that forms like *timidus*, etc., became already in Primitive Ital. regarded in the 'Sprachgefühl' so entirely as simple adjectives that they lost all connection with the original verb from which they came, and hence also in Primitive Ital. a new form destined to remain in connection with the verb and capable of governing a case like the verb *finite* had to be coined, and it was coined by means of the same suffix as the earlier form, hence *timendu-s* : *timi-du-s*.

Edendus, if my theory be right, will mean 'giving (or, if from $\sqrt{dh\bar{e}}$ -, 'making, causing') the act-of-eating.' Thus *cibus est edendus* 'food is giving (causing) the act-of-eating,' i. e. 'the food may (must) be eaten.'

Roby (Latin Gr. II, p. lxxiv) mentions "two points, which, though certainly not conclusive, seem to afford some confirmation of the view, that the passive sense of the gerundive is really due to an attraction and not to any original passive meaning." His first point is that the agent with the gerundive is regularly expressed by the dative, whereas the agent with passive verbs is regularly expressed by the ablative with *ab*. The uses, it is true, do overlap, but only very slightly. He gives the statistics on pp. lxxiv and lxxv, and adds that in most cases where we find the agent after the gerundive expressed by the abl. with *ab*, the reason for the divergence from the ordinary construction is evident. It is in many cases due either (*a*) to a fear lest ambiguity should arise if the dative were used, or (*b*) to a desire to balance neighbouring clauses.

The second point to which Roby draws attention is that deponent verbs have the gerundive in full use just as much as other verbs. In none other of their forms have they a passive meaning, hence it is hardly likely that they have such a meaning in the gerundive.

Roby also shows that the use of some past participles of deponents, e. g. *testatus*, *meditatus*, etc., in both an active and passive sense, is far from parallel, for various reasons given on p. lxxvi.

Both these points which Roby mentions seem quite easily explicable by the theory which I have given of the origin of the gerundive:—

(*a*) The so-called 'dative of the agent after the gerundive' would turn out to be really an ethic dative, or better, 'dative of advantage,' after the idea of 'giving' in the suffix *do*-; e. g. *Aliorum iudicio permulta nobis et facienda et non facienda et mutanda et corrigenda sunt* (Cic. Off. I 41) 'In the opinion of others there are very many things which give (cause) us the doing, the non-doing, the changing and the correcting,' i. e. 'there are many things which we may or should do,' etc., i. e. 'which should be done by us,' etc.

(*β*) The deponent verbs may have a gerundive just as much as the active verbs. *Admirandus est* 'he gives a cause of wonderment,' the meaning is originally active, but it is obvious that

'he gives a cause of wonderment' is equivalent to 'he is to be wondered at.'

Next, to take an instance which does not fall under either (a) or (β), e. g. Oscan *trífbum ekak . . . úpsannam deded* (quoted above) 'he offered this building as giving or causing work,' i. e. 'gave this building to be worked or built.'

Thus, then, these forms in *-ndo-* were originally active, but from their use they shaded into a passive meaning, and hence came to be regarded as passives. The active meaning, however, is manifest in a few forms, all of which are intransitive.

Volvendus 'rolling,' or more literally 'giving a roll,' i. e. 'allowing of a roll,' occurs frequently, e. g. *plumbea glans longo cursu volvenda calescit*, *Lucr.* 6. 177; *secundus* 'that which gives the act of following,' hence 'following.' Cf. also *oriundus*, *iucundus* 'that which gives or allows pleasure,' hence 'pleasant'; cf. *Roby, Lat. Gr.*, p. lxxviii: "Though some of these (e. g. *oriundus*, *secundus*, *jucundus*) have become mere adjectives without any special verbal use, the meaning of a present participle appears clearly to be the original meaning with all. And this participle was not passive. The only words which could suggest a passive meaning are *volvendus*, *oriundus* and *rotundus*. But in the case of *volvendus*, Vergil has negated the necessity of the supposition by putting *volventibus annis* (*A. I.* 234)¹ by the side of *volvendis mensibus* (*ib.* 269); and Lucretius speaks of *volventia lustra* (5. 931) as he does of *volvenda aetas* (*ib.* 1276); *oriundus* is from a deponent (comp. also *oriens*), and *rotundus* may be compared to *rotans* in Vergil's *saxa rotantia late Impulerat torrens* (*A. 10.* 362)."

That my translation of *volvendus*, etc., 'giving a roll,' etc., as applied to the substantive with which *volvendus*, etc., are in agreement, and as equivalent to 'rolling,' is perfectly defensible is shown by the frequent use of *dare* in this way in Lucretius, e. g. II 311 *dat motus* = 'facit motus, movetur'; II 1149 *dabunt labem putrisque ruinas* (said of the things themselves falling to ruin); and similarly V 347 *darent cladem magnasque ruinas*; cf. also *dare pausam* = 'facere pausam, cessare.' Vergil also uses *dare* thus, e. g. XII 575 *Dant cuneum* = 'They make themselves into a wedge.'

According to Max Müller (*Science of Language*, 2d series, p. 224), it is possible that here we have a trace of the *√ dh̄*. On this point v. *supra*. Compare the English expressions 'give a cry, a laugh, a shout, a cough, a start, a leap, a jump, a shudder,'

¹ Cf. *περιτελλομένων ἐναντῶν*.

which simply mean 'cry, laugh, shout, cough, start, leap, jump, shudder,' as referring to the subject of the verb in question. We may add also Gk. *ἐλ-ο-μαι* from **Feλ-o-* (beside Lat. *vel-le*) 'give a wish,' whence 'wish'; *μει-άω* (beside Skr. *smāy-a-te*) 'give a smile,' whence 'smile'; etc. (vide Brugmann, Gr. II, §695).

As regards the form of words like *rotundu-s*, *rubicundu-s* I would agree with Brugmann in his second theory (v. supra).

6. Having thus explained the gerundive both as to form and meaning, we are now in a position to examine the gerund. The gerund probably did not arise until such time as the infinitive had lost its use as a substantive, and had come to be used as essentially part of the verb. To supply the need thus created, the neuter singular of the gerundive was employed as an abstract substantive, both with the inherent meaning of the gerundive and also with the original meaning which the infinitive, whose place it was to fill, had while it was still a substantive, viz. *the abstract idea of the meaning indicated by the root of the word itself*. Like the gerundive, it is originally active in meaning; thus, *edendum est* 'there is an eating,' i. e. 'one may eat'; *eundum est* 'there is a going,' i. e. 'one may go'; *vir ad agendum idoneus* 'a man fit for doing'; *Gutta cavat lapidem non vi sed saepe cadendo* (Lucr.) 'The drop hollows the stone not by its violence, but by often falling.' Again, to take an example of a gerund with a case after it: *Domino est parendum* 'There is an obeying the lord,' i. e. 'the lord should be obeyed.' In all these we may still see the force of the *-do-* by translating literally, e. g. 'there is a giving (or causing) the act-of-giving,' i. e. 'one may or should go'; likewise 'a man fit for a giving-the-action,' i. e. 'for a chance of acting.'

The notion that the gerund is passive as well as active is based on its use in sentences such as e. g. (1) *anulus subter tenuatur habendo*, Lucretius 1. 312; (2) *equi ante domandum ingentes tollunt animos*, Verg. 9. 3. 206; (3) *cibus facillimus ad concoquendum*, Cic. Fin. 2. 28. But these are explicable in the same way: (1) 'A ring is worn away by giving or allowing the holding,' or by the abstract idea of 'holding,' which is indefinite—neither active nor passive; (2) 'Horses before "taming" or "before the giving a chance to tame" raise their spirits high'; (3) 'Food very easy for giving thorough cooking.' With regard to the first instance, '*anulus subter tenuatur habendo*,' taken in conjunction with the above-quoted '*Gutta cavat lapidem non vi sed saepe cadendo*' (also Lucretius), it may be worth while to compare

Ovid, p. 4, 10. 5 *Gutta cavat lapidem, consumitur anulus usu*, obviously a reminiscence (or a plagiarism) of Lucretius. Ovid thus uses the abstract word *usu* as equivalent to the *habendo* of Lucretius, thus showing how easily the gerund, though originally active both in form and meaning, could nevertheless shade off into an apparently quasi-passive meaning.

7. It will be well to add the possibility (pace Brugmann) that, after all, the gerund was the earlier formation, and the gerundive the later. It is true that we find no instance of the gerund in the Umbrian-Samnite monuments; but they are scarcely sufficiently extensive to enable us to assume therefrom that the gerundive was *necessarily* the earlier formation of the two. Moreover, as mentioned above, the gerund is more frequent than the gerundive in Early Latin.

My explanation of the form will fit equally well with this view.¹ Thus, e. g., the gerund *agendum* would have been formed as a substantive with the meaning 'that which gives action,' or more abstract still (as it was to take the place in Latin of the vanished infin. in *-m*), 'action.' Then to *agendum* was built the adjective *agendus* = 'giving action,' which may have arisen originally from cases where *agendum* was the predicate, e. g. *hoc est agendum* 'this is a thing giving (or causing) action,' where *agendum* was misunderstood as an adjective.

Again, take a deponent verb *admirandum est* 'it is a wonder,' whence *admirandus est* 'he is a wonder,' i. e. 'wonderful.'

It may be said that this explanation falls to the ground because in Umbrian-Samnite these Prim. Ital. infinitives in *-m* survive, and that therefore no gerund was needed to take their place as in Latin. *But they do not survive with their primitive meaning of abstract nouns*; they have become thoroughly incorporated in the verb-system, and show no trace of their original meaning as substantives; and therefore there is no reason why a gerund should not have existed in Umbrian-Samnite, even though we have none actually preserved to us in the surviving monuments.

However, all said and done, I still adhere to my former view that the gerundive was the earlier formation of the two.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENG.

L. HORTON-SMITH.

¹ Or, inasmuch as there is nothing to show the original quantity of *-dum* on this theory, it might therefore be itself an infinitive = **da-om*, **dh₂-om*, etc., but still governing the first member of the compound as its object.

.NOTE.

THE LATIN GERUNDIVE *-ndo-*.¹

This formation is explained in the handbooks before me as follows: 1st, as indirectly, that is to say, by an unusual phonetic, connected with the Greek suffix *-μενο-*. Accordingly it is assumed that the original meaning of the future participle of obligation is that of a simple passive participle (cf. V. Henry, *Gr. Comp.*, §137).

2d. Brugmann, in his *Vergl. Gram.* II, §69, equates *-ndo-* with a suffix *-tno-* after vowels (A. J. P. VIII 441-7). This was based on the use of the same suffix in Lithuanian as a participle of necessity.

3d. Brugmann abandons this view in §1103 and makes the form an infinitive in *-m* (accusative) plus a postposition *do* ('to').

The objections to the first view lie in the defective phonetic, and a strained sematology. Brugmann abandons the second view because there is nothing necessarily Aryan in the Lithuanian suffix *-tinās*. The third view is based on the assumption that the formation is specifically Latin, and must fall to the ground as soon as an Aryan connection is made good.

This I now attempt to do. I begin by insisting on the syntactical relation of the gerund and gerundive—a dat. gerund+acc. object may become a dative of both gerundive and governed noun. Now this phenomenon meets us in the Sanskrit dative infinitives, that the object noun is attracted into the dative case. Such a marked correspondence ought not to be accidental.

What is the infinitive in *°dhyāi*? Brugmann (§1088, 9; 1089, 12), following Bartholomae, explains *°dhyāi* as a dative to a noun from the root **dhē*, whose weakest stage is *dh-*. Accordingly the form *Feideσ-θαι* is explained as an acc. (loc.?) of the root-noun **Feides*+a root-infinitive **dhāi* = 'for putting,' ∴ = 'for putting into knowledge.' The subsequent division *Feide-σθαι* was a very natural popular etymology.

¹ Professor FAY's note on the Gerundive was written in January last, and came into the Editor's hands only two or three days after Mr. HORTON-SMITH's essay on the same subject had been sent to the printer. It is needless to emphasize the interest of the coincidences and differences of the simultaneous research along the same lines.—B. L. G.

With the details of this explanation I do not entirely agree, though accepting its substance. We should expect in Greek $^{\circ}\theta\alpha\iota$, not $^{\circ}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. This confusion crept in from 2d sg. act. $^{\circ}\sigma\theta\alpha$, by which 2d plur. $^{\circ}\sigma\theta\epsilon$ was affected, for the distinction of number breaks down entirely in the 2d person. It is possible that $-\sigma\theta-$ || $-\theta-$ crept in with the 1st plural $-\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ for $-\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, by a popular interpretation of $\mu\epsilon + \sigma\theta\alpha$ 'I and thou.' (Cf. the summary of my Studies in Agglutination in Proc. Am. Or. Soc. 1894.)

In this explanation we must observe that Grk. $^{\circ}\theta\alpha\iota$ does not equal Sk. $^{\circ}dhy\ddot{a}i$, a dative from a feminine stem in $dh-\bar{i}$ according to my explanation, but equals an Aryan $*dh\ddot{a}i$, a dative to a fem. in $-\ddot{a}$, Sk. $*dh\ddot{a}$. So we have in the root-noun $j\ddot{a}$ - a dative (fem.) $j\acute{e}$, but an infinitive-dative ($prati-$) $m\ddot{a}i$, ($par\ddot{a}-$) $d\ddot{a}i$. An infinitive $*dh\ddot{a}i$ is every way justified. To a typical infinitive $y\acute{a}jadh\ddot{y}\ddot{a}i$ we can assume (as must be assumed for the Greek infinitive above) a by-form $*y\acute{a}jadh\ddot{a}i$.

It was seen in $F\epsilon\lambda\delta\epsilon\sigma-\theta\alpha\iota$ that we have a locative, or at any rate some terminal case in composition with $^{\circ}dh\ddot{a}i$. Now $*y\acute{a}jadh\ddot{a}i$ may be a similar syntactical formation. Suppose we restore an Aryan $*y\acute{a}jndh\ddot{a}i$ from $y\acute{a}jen dh\ddot{a}i$, a suffixless locative from an $-en$ -stem? Now this corresponds precisely with a Latin type *legendae*, e. g. Sk. $*bharadh\ddot{a}i = ferendae$; the form $bh\acute{a}radhy\ddot{a}i$ is in actual existence. The assumption of this locative to a stem in $-en$ is most easy: Sanskrit uses datives from *man-* and *van-* stems as infinitives, and so does Greek; cf. the stock examples *vidm\acute{a}ne*: $F\acute{\iota}\delta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$, $d\acute{a}u\acute{v}\acute{a}ne$: $\delta\acute{o}F\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$. Greek further shows forms in simple $-en$ -stems, e. g. $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\epsilon\nu$ and other Doric forms (cf. Boisacq, *Les Dialectes Doriens*, p. 201). Whitney explains the Sk. infinitives in $-sani$ as locatives of $-en$ -stems to roots increased by $-s-$. Brugmann suggests that Grk. imperatives in $-ov-$, e. g. Syrak $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\omicron\nu$, Att. $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\xi\omicron\nu$ are infinitives. We can explain the Att.-Ionic pres. infin. $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\nu$ as from $*\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota =$ Sk. $bh\acute{a}rase$ (Wh., Gr.² 973 a), whence $*\phi\epsilon\rho\eta\iota$; and by association with $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\nu$, made the easier by the paragogic ν , we reach $*\phi\epsilon\rho\eta\nu$ and $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\nu$. According to this line of argument we must restore Sk. $bh\acute{a}radhy\ddot{a}i$ from $*bhern\ddot{d}hy\ddot{a}i$ and Lat. *ferendae* from $*bhern\ddot{d}h\ddot{a}i$.

There is no reason, however, why we should not regard this form in $-en-$ as an acc. to a root-noun, and this seems to me the better explanation.

The accentual conditions of the Aryan form seem not to have been fixed. We have in Sk. $bh\acute{a}radhy\ddot{a}i$ a strong stem

and the accent on the root. In Latin *ferundus* from **ferondus* we have the *e* and *o* grades in the position they would take most naturally in a rigid gradation, such as I have indicated for the perfects in my article in *Am. Jour. of Philol.* XIII 479. We also have Sanskrit types with weak roots and penultimate accents, e. g. *huvádhyāi*, where in a perfect gradation we ought to expect **huvándhyāi*. We have also strong roots with penultimate accent, e. g. *tarádhyāi*. We should expect for *tarádhyāi* an accentuation **taradhyāi*, representing an Indo-European **torṇ-dhyāi*. Now remembering that we have set up an origin out of a syntactical combination for this infinitive, we may reconstruct a combination **spāṣan dh(y)āi* = 'for putting in vision (i. e. seeing)' (cf. *tákṣ-an-*, Brug., *Verg. Gr.* II, §114), where each word has its own accent; in **ukṣán dhyāi*, however, after the combination became inseparable the accentuation might naturally become **ukṣándhyāi*; **táksṇ dhyāi*, on the other hand, gave **táksa-dhyāi*, and these types remained after **ukṣándhyāi* had become **ukṣádhyāi* to correspond with *táksadhyāi*.

A trace of the double accentuation may still be found, perhaps, in Sanskrit. At a time when they still said **táksṇ dhyāi*, and very possibly **táksṇ dhé* from **dhāi* (cf. *supra*), the infinitive *étave* acquired an analogical by-form *étavāi*, fashioned after **táksṇ dhyāi* and endowed, like it, with two accents; now when **táksṇ dhyāi* was later affected by **ukṣándhyai*, as assumed above, *étavāi* retained its analogical accent after its prototype had lost the same. No other explanation so well accounts for the puzzling double accent.

Lat. *ferendae* may represent an Indo-European **bhérṇdhai*, Sk. *bhāradh(y)āi*, or a possible accentuation **bharnḍhāi*, a type of formation testified to by Avestan, and possibly by Greek. In Sanskrit the infinitive always appears as *-a-dhyāi*. In Avestan *-dyāi* is generally added directly to the root (Kanga, *Avest. Gram.*, §566); sometimes the termination is *-a-dyāi*, as in Sk., used sometimes with a tense-stem, giving *-a-* the appearance of being a thematic vowel. This is also true in Sanskrit (Wh.², §976). Bartholomae (*Alt-ir. Dial.*, §352) cites the form *verⁿdyāi*, in which he ascribes the *n* to the *nā*-class present stem. With this we must compare Vedic *prⁿádhyāi* : $\sqrt{pr} < n >$. We see that the formations are not identical. We ought instead to compare *verⁿ-d-yāi* with Lat. *volen-d-i*.

In Greek also traces of this formation are to be found. The form *πεφάνθαι* (Plato) is too late to claim for primitive type, though if we put Vedic *vāṇṛdhādhyāi* beside it we might ascribe it to a primitive **be-bhṇ-n-dhāi*. We may, however, give a typical character to *Μελανθεύς* || *Μελάνθιος*, *Μελανθώ*, son and daughter of *Δολίος* (ρ 212, σ 322). I define by 'servitor': *μελω* 'care for,' and compare Lat. *mereo* 'serve.' In Greek there is variation between ρ and λ—*μέριμνα*: *μελέδημα* 'anxiety.' *Μελανθεύς* was a sort of general-purpose servant—a goat-herd by profession (ι 11 times), he acts as butler (υ 255) and fire-maker (φ 176, 181). The notion that *Μελανθεύς* was by origin a common rather than a proper name finds support in its double form, -*θείς* being, as it were, an individualization of -*θιος*, and in its having a feminine -*θώ*.

This argument becomes stronger when we consider the name of the father *Δολίος*,¹ who was a *δμῶς* ('domestic') Penelope had brought from her father's (δ 736); his sons got ready the meal in ω 412 (cf. Lat. *merenda* 'meal').

In the -*ανθ-* of *Μελανθεύς* I see an -*ṇ-* + *dh-*, and explain -*αν-* (for -*a-*, i. e. *a*, from *ṇ*) as due to the conservatism of proper names (cf. Class. Rev. VII, p. 61).

In -*θιος* the kinship with -*dhyāi* || -*dhiyāi* is patent.

In accordance with the above explanation the aor. infin. in -*a<σ>θαι* might be explained for *ṇ + <σ>dh-*. This would lighten the rather overweighted analogical explanation of the σ-aorist in Greek. Only 1st sg. *σα* is strictly phonetic, for 3d plur. -*σαν* should be -*σα(τ)*.²

I have sought to justify phonetically the equation Latin *fer-en-dae* = Sk. *bhār-a-dh-yāi*; cf. Grk. *φέρει<σ>θ-αι*. I end with a comparison of the syntax of *ferendae* and *bhāradhyāi*.

It must be noted that Sanskrit does not always attract the acc. object of the infinitive into the dative: *tvāṁ sīṁ vṛshann akṛnor duṣṭārītu sāho vīcvasmāi sáhase sáhadhyāi* (RV. 6. 1. 1) = 'Thou

¹ *Δολίος* 'tricksy' is a form parallel to *δοῦλος* 'slavish,' from a stem *dōlyo-* || *dōlyo-*, a relation seen in *ἄλλος*: Lat. *alius*. The meaning 'slave' for *δοῦλος* was got by contrast to *ἐλεύθερος* 'outspoken, frank, free' (cf. Aesch. Pers. 593 *ἐλεύθερα βάσειν* with *δόλια ἔπεα*, ι 282); *κητήρα*—*ἐλεύθερον*, Z 528, has back of it somewhere the notion *in vino veritas*, and *ἐλεύθερον ἡμαρ*, Z 455, compared with *δούλιον ἡμαρ*, ξ 340, lets us suppose a contrast of *ἐλεύθερα ἔπεα* with *δόλια ἔπεα* 'frank' opposed to 'guarded' ('tricksy') speech.

² In my Studies in Agglutination (supra l. c.) I explain the -*σα-* aor. as a feminine verb-form.

showest, hero, unsurpassable might for overcoming every force.' Cf. Sall.: *Lepidus arma cepit libertatis subvertendae* 'Lepidus took up arms to overthrow liberty'; *dviṣās tarādhyā ṛṇayā na zyase* (RV. 9. 110. 1) = 'As an avenger dost thou come to conquer our enemies'; *iusiurandum rei servandae, non per-
dundae conditumst* (Plaut. Rud. 1374) 'the oath was seasoned to preserve and not destroy my stuff.' In the last Latin example *rei* may be a dative, and not a genitive; the first example shows that the genitive of characteristic, along with the indistinguishable gen. and dat. forms of 1st and 5th declensions, had shifted the Latin conception from a dative to a genitive. In the grammars I have at hand I find among the examples for this construction 16 feminines to 7 masculines, and register in the feminines 9 first- and fifth-declension nouns to 5 of other declensions. Sanskrit and Latin furnish similar examples for the construction with nouns or adjectives, e. g. *dādhr̥vir bhāradhyāi* = 'capable of bearing'; *referundae ego habeo linguam natam grātia* (Plaut.) 'I have a tongue was born (is fit) for showing gratitude.'

Touching the active and passive meanings of the Latin gerundive: if we assume for *bhāradhyāi* an original sense = 'for putting into bearing,' it passed at once into the notion 'for bearing.' Now if we say *natus est gratiae referundae*, we might also say **gratia [nobis] referundae est* = 'gratitude is [for us] for bearing,' passing at once into 'we must show gratitude.' The fact that the infinitive is of either voice at will ought now to be almost a commonplace. In RV. 10. 108 we have a pertinent example: the *Paṇis* have asked Saramā how she got over the river; she answers: *atiṣkādo bhiyāsā tān na āvat* = 'therefore (the river) helped me in fear of (my) leaping over,' or if we do not supply the notion 'my,' 'in fear of being leapt over.' The secret of the passive lies in an indefinite subject: *vivit* is a definite 'he lives,' *vivitur* an indefinite 'one lives.'

Sanskrit went through all the changes of Latin, but not with root-nouns. *ratnadhā* || ā-, e. g., may be explained as **ratnṃ + dhā* 'present-giving,' and in respect of inflection it acts precisely as a gerundive would do; another common word is *vayo-dhā* 'strength-giving.' These are on just the same plane as *sec-undus* 'success-giving, favoring' (cf. L. and Sh., s. v. *sequor*, II, B. 5) and *fāc-undus* 'fluent' (cf. L. and Sh., s. v. *facilis*, I, B. a), which a popular etymology has connected with *fā-ri*.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Sacred Books of the Old Testament. A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, printed in colors, with Notes by eminent Biblical Scholars of Europe and America, edited by PAUL HAUPT, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. Part 17. The Book of Job, by C. SIEGFRIED. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichsche Buchhandlung. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1893.

The Book of Job. Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text, with Notes by C. SIEGFRIED, Professor in the University of Jena. English Translation of the Notes by R. E. BRÜNNOW, Professor in the University of Heidelberg.

It is greatly to be regretted that, at the present day, not only the masses, but even persons of cultivation have, to a considerable extent, lost the habit of reading the Bible; the brilliant results of modern science appearing to possess greater attractions than the study of the Holy Scriptures. It is the more gratifying, therefore, that a generous American, whose name is withheld, desiring to aid in inducing a more general study of the Bible, has contributed a considerable sum of money towards the realization of this object. A fitting head for this great enterprise has been found in the person of Prof. Paul Haupt, who, for more than ten years, has been engaged in active work as professor of Semitic languages in the Johns Hopkins University, at Baltimore, and who, in 1890, organized the undertaking. The plan of the work includes a new translation into English and German of the whole Bible, both of the Old and New Testaments, embracing the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha. The English translation is to appear first. In addition to the translations a new critical edition of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is to be brought out, accompanied by brief textual notes. The advisability of this plan is obvious. It is the part of each contributor to prepare, by the critical treatment of the text assigned to him, the basis of his translation; while readers of the translations need not be troubled with philological explanations, intelligible only to specialists.

"The Hebrew text," says the prospectus, "shall be the exact counterpart of the English translation. If a translation is based on a departure from the Masoretic text, this deviation must appear in the Hebrew text. If a transposition has been made in the translation, it must also be made in the Hebrew text. The latter shall represent the reconstructed text from which the translator has made his translation. The emendations must, therefore, appear in the text, and the Masoretic reading in the notes appended."

The editor has secured the services of a number of eminent scholars for his enterprise. Nine American, fourteen English, twelve German and one Australian scholar are contributors: the only Dutch contributor, Prof. A. Kuenen, of Leyden, has since died, and his place has been taken by Dr. M. Jastrow, Jr.,

of Philadelphia. Another contributor, Prof. Aug. Müller, of Halle, whose early death is deeply to be lamented, had sent in his contribution ready for the press.

The contributors are expected to apply to the Sacred Books the same principles of criticism that prevail in the domain of classical philology, and the plan, briefly outlined, is as follows:

1. The various books of the Bible are to be faithfully and clearly rendered on the basis of a text, completed in accordance with all the resources of modern science. "The translation should be 'literal' in the higher sense of the word, i. e. render the sense of the original as faithfully as possible. It is unnecessary to endeavor to give one English word for one Hebrew, or to conform to the Hebrew laws of syntactical construction. The object of the work is not a revision of the A. V., but a new translation in modern English."

2. The contributors are to explain, so far as possible, the origin and composition of the books assigned them.

3. The attempt will be made to render the text more intelligible to the reader, by means of brief historical and archaeological notes, paraphrases of difficult passages, citations of parallels (Biblical, classical and modern), as also by the use of maps and pictorial illustrations. Each contributor is responsible for his own share of the work. (Cf. the remarks of Prof. C. Budde, of Strassburg, in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 20, 1893, pp. 494-7.)

As to the Hebrew text, "it should be left unpointed except in ambiguous cases; nor is it necessary to point all emendations adopted. Of course, where the emendation involves merely a departure from the Masoretic points, the vocalization must be supplied." Departures from the received text are indicated by diacritical marks, which enable the reader to see at once whether the deviation has the authority of an Ancient Version, whether it relates merely to the Qêrê, or whether it is conjectural. Hopelessly corrupt passages are not received into the text, but indicated by points, while asterisks mark lacunae in the original. The various diacritical marks adopted by the editor are very ingeniously devised, and another excellent feature is the employment of colors, to designate the sources, in books of composite structure, as, for example, the historical books of the Old Testament, and especially the Book of Job, to which we will now turn.

The first number of the new series, which has appeared, is the edition of the Hebrew text of the Book of Job, by Prof. CARL SIEGFRIED, of Jena, who, in connection with Prof. BERNHARD STADE, of Giessen, has recently published a Hebrew Dictionary of the Old Testament (Leipzig, 1893). A thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, cautious and skilful use of previous writings, independence of judgment, conciseness of expression, great care in matters of detail—all these qualities, which are exhibited in all former works of Prof. Siegfried, are to be found in no less degree in the present one. The accuracy and conscientiousness of the author appear throughout, and even those who do not always agree with his conclusions will admit that his edition is the result of careful research, and contains many valuable suggestions. In the new critical edition of the Book of Job, the Hebrew text is arranged in the following order (cf. p. 49): chapters 1-12; 13, 1-27; 14, 4. 3. 6. 13. 15-17. 1-2; 13, 28; 14, 5. 7-12. 14. 18-22; 15-19; 20, 1-15a. 23a. 15b-29; 21, 1-8. 11.

10. 9. 12-34; 22-24, 8. 10-25; 26, 5-14. 1-4; 27-28; 29, 1-6. 19-20. 7-11. 21-23. 12-13. 15-17. 24-25. 14. 18; 30, 1-24. 26-31; 31, 1-20; 30, 25; 31, 21-23. 38-40. 24-37. 40c; 38-42; 32-37.

The following passages, being later interpolations, are relegated from the text and appear in the footnotes: chapters 4, vv. 10-11; 5, 1+6-7; 6, 10c; 8, 6b; 9, 21c; 10, 3a (partly)+17c+22c; 11, 6b+7-9+12+14; 12, 3b+4b+6c+11-12; 15, 19+25-28+30a; 16, 8c+10-11+13a+22; 17, 1+11-16; 18, 13a; 19, 25-26+27a. b; 21, 8a (partly); 22, 8+18; 23, 8-9; 24, 9; 27, 1; 28, 3c; 30, 1a (partly)+2b; 38, 13b+15; 39, 25c; 40, 15b; 41, 1-4; 33, 23b; 34, 18; 37, 6-8+12b+23c.

The following passages, being *parallel compositions*, are printed in BLUE: 7, 1-10; 10, 18-22+22c; 12, 4-6+4c+6c; 14, 1-2; 13, 28; 14, 5. 7. 8-12. 14. 18-22; 17, 11-16; 40, 6-42, 6.

The following passages, being *correcting interpolations conforming the speeches of Job to the orthodox doctrine of retribution*, are printed in RED: 12, 7-10. 13-25; 13, 1+12, 11-12; 21, 16-18; 24, 13-24; 27, 7-23.

The following passages, being *polemical interpolations directed against the tendency of the poem*, are printed in GREEN: 28, 1-28+28, 3c, and the Elihu speeches (chapters 32-37), which are given in a special appendix.

A concordance is appended, facilitating reference to verses which appear in the new edition out of the traditional order.

We are not informed as to the principle followed by Prof. Siegfried in rejecting glosses, in restoring the original order, and in distinguishing the sources or amplifications of the original text, the explanation of all these points being deferred, in accordance with the general plan of the work, until the publication of the English translation. Siegfried's arrangement of the text differs considerably from that of Georg Hoffmann in his edition (*Hiob nach Joh. Georg Ernst Hoffmann*, Kiel, 1891). Siegfried has not referred to this edition, although in Siegfried and Stade's *Hebrew Dictionary*, Hoffmann is quoted several times; cf. e. g. *Lexic.*, p. 602 b, where פִּרְשֵׁן, Job 26, 9, is emended, with Hoffmann, into פִּרְשֵׁי, in accordance with Job 36, 30. Siegfried has also quoted, in his notes to the edition of Job, pp. 30 and 34, G. Hoffmann's essay in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, and, pp. 34 and 44, his *Phönikische Inschriften*.

G. Hoffmann assumes, besides the original author, an author of the Elihu speeches and a reviser, who, after the insertion of the Elihu speeches—partly by transposing passages and partly by interpolating verses—endeavored to alter the sense of the book. He arranges the text of Job as follows (p. 7): Job 1-24, 12; Bildad 25. 24, 13-25; 26-27, 2-6; Zophar 27, 7-28, 28; 29, 2-31, 34. 38-40b. 35-37; 38, 1-13a. 14a. 16-22. 24-39, 30; 40, 15-41, 5-26; 40, 2-14; 42; Elihu 32, 1. 6-34, 1-22. 24-28. 23. 29-37; Reviser 27, 1; 29, 1; 31, 40c; 32, 2-5; 38, 13b. 14b. 15. 23; 40, 1; 41, 1-4.

The dialogue of Job has been recently (1892-93) critically treated by Prof. Bickell, of Vienna (cf. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, VI 137-47, 241-57, 327-34; VII 1-20, 153-68). Siegfried was unable to make use of this work, as only two of Bickell's articles had appeared when his book went to press. The results reached in Bickell's essay, which is quite analogous to his treatise on Proverbs, are based on the assumption that the original

dialogue (except the eight-line speech of the Lord), as well as the Elihu speeches and the description of the two Nile-monsters, are composed throughout in four-line strophes, and that the Alexandrian translator of the book has not intentionally omitted anything which he found in his original. In accordance with these two principles, Bickell rejects everything not agreeing with the four-line strophe. In the following I give a survey of the text edited by him, the letter A in parenthesis referring to emendations of the text on the basis of LXX: 3, 2-26; 4, 1. 3-4. 6-21; 5, 1-2. 4-22. 24-27; 6, 1-6. 8-16. 19. 17. 22-30; 7, 1-7. 9-22; 8, 1-3. 5. 6*b-c* (A). 8. 10-22; 9, 1-8. 10-14. 15*b*. a. 17-22 (A). 23-24*a*. 25-28. 30-35; 10, 1*a*. *b*. 2-3. 4*b*. 5*b*-14. 15-17*a* (A). 17*b*. 18-21; 11, 1-3. 5-6. 8-9. 11-13. 15-16. 17*b*. a. 18-20; 12, 1-3*a*. 4*c* (A). 5-6*b*. 7-8. 10-17. 18 (A). 19*b*-22. 24-25; 13, 1-19*a*. 20*a*. 21-27*b*. a. *c*. *d*; 14, 1-3; 13, 28; 14, 5*a-b*. 6-10. 12*a-b*. 13-17; 15, 1-5. 7-9. 11-13. 15-16. 18-22. 23*c*-24*a*. 25-26. 30*b*-35; 16, 1-4*b*. 5. 7 (A). 9. 10*b*-22; 17, 1 (A). 2*a*. 3. 5-11. 13-16; 18, 1-3. 4*b*-8. 9*b*. 11-14. 17*a*. 18*a*. 19*a*. 17*b*-19*b*. 15*a*. 20-21; 19, 1-3. 5-26. 27*c*-28*a*. 29*a-b* (A); 20, 1. 2*a* (A). 4*a* (A). 5-8. 10 (A). 15-19. 21-22. 23*b*-27. 29; 21, 1-7. 9-10. 8. 11-14. 16-17*b*. 18-20; 14, 21-22; 21, 22. 24-27. 34; 22, 1-11. 12 (A). 17-19. 21-23. 26-28; 23, 1-8. 10-13. 15-17; 24, 1-4. 25; 25, 1-3; 26, 12-13. 14*c-d* (A); 25, 4-6; 26, 1-2. 4; 27, 2. 4-6. 11-12; 28, 1-3*a*. 9*b*-10*a*. 11*b*. 20-21*a*. 22*b*-25. 27-28; 27, 7-10. 14-18*a*. 19*a*. 20; 29, 1-9. 11-17. 21-22; 30, 1-2. 8-11. 13. 14*b*-15. 17-18*a*. 19*b*-20*a*. 21. 22*b*-25. 26 (A). 27*b*-31; 31, 5-7*b*. 8-14. 23. 15-17. 19-22. 24-27. 29-37; 38, 1-18. 21. 19-20. 22-25. 29-31. 35. 37-41; 39, 1*b*-2*a*. 3*b*-4*a*. 5*a*. 6*a*. 7. 9-11. 19-26. 27*b*. 29*a*; 40, 2. 8-14; 42, 1; 40, 4-5; 42, 2. 3*c-d*. 5-6.

Tristichs: 24, 5-6. 7*b*-8. 10-11. 12 (A); 30, 4. 3*a*. 5-7; 24, 13. 18*b*-19. 20-22 (A). 23-24.

Elihu: 32, 6-10. 11 (A). 13. 14 (A). 18 (A). 19-22; 33, 1. 3-10. 12-15*a*. 15*c*-19*a*. 20*a*. 21-26*b*. 27*a*. 26*c*. 27*b*-28. 31*a*; 34, 1-2 (A). 5-6. 8-9. 10*b*-17. 18 (partly). 19. 20*b*-22. 24*a*. 25*a*. 26-27 (A). 34-37*a*. 37*c*; 35, 2-3. 5-7*a*. 10*b* (A). 11. 13-14; 36, 2-4. 5-6*a* (A). 12. 14-15. 6*b*-7*a*. 18-19. 21*a*. 22*b*-24. 27-28 (A). 33; 37, 1. 5*b*. 6*a*. 7-9. 11-12 (A). 14-17. 19-21*b*. 22*b*-24.

Nile-monsters: 40, 15-18. 20-21. 25-32; 41, 5-8. 10. 12-15*a*. 16 (partly). 17. 18 (A). 20*a*. 19. 20*b*. 21*b*-26.

A comparison of the above schemes will show how greatly the three editions of the text, which have appeared within the last two years, differ from one another. Bickell, who rejects more than 520 verses, and Siegfried are of opinion that the text of Job is very considerably interpolated. The latter assumes, in addition to the original author, an author of parallel compositions, and one who has endeavored to bring the speeches of Job into conformity with the orthodox doctrine of retribution. He considers the Elihu speeches to be interpolations, as against Stickel, Budde, Cornill and other scholars, and rejects from the text as still later interpolations 111 verses, and two portions of verses. Georg Hoffmann is much more conservative in assuming interpolations and in transposing individual verses. Which of these views will ultimately prevail the future must determine. When the LXX and the other versions have been systematically and accurately edited, it may, perhaps, be possible to obtain the original uncorrupted text of Job; for the present, however, attempts in this direction, though they may bring us nearer to a solution of the problem, can hardly settle the matter definitely.

In Siegfried's edition the text of the poetic portions of the book is printed in short lines and in two columns, the verses being divided. The whole is divided into sections in accordance with the sense. Siegfried has made no attempt to build up artificial and regular strophes, and has had no recourse to the metre in his reconstruction of the text. In this I believe he is entirely right. Our knowledge of Hebrew prosody stands as yet upon a very insecure basis, and it seems to me that great caution should be exercised here. In the department of classical philology the metre has, I am well aware, suggested many excellent emendations, and that this also holds true in case of the Avesta I freely admit. But when we remember the difference of opinion which prevails in regard to the metrical structure of the different portions of the Avesta—how one scholar takes to be metrical what another regards as prose, how one rejects as glosses not only words but whole sentences, while another feels himself at liberty to transpose and make additions as he pleases—we cannot be too cautious in the application of metre as a means of textual criticism. What I have said of the Avesta applies, *mutatis mutandis*, equally to the Book of Job. As Dillmann (Commentar zum Hiob, 4. Aufl., 1891, pp. xxiii-xxiv) rightly points out, there appears, in the Book of Job, a good sense of measure and symmetry in the structure of the whole, as well as in the individual parts. The short strophe, consisting in general of two members, each containing three or four words, is carried with great art through all the poetic speeches of the book. The speeches are constructed in a similar artistic manner: in each of them may be perceived a regular strophic structure, sometimes (e. g. chap. 3, 30) specially indicated. But nothing more than the greatest possible evenness of structure can be asserted. In some of them, especially in the shorter speeches, the structure is perfectly (chap. 8, 11. 26) or nearly (chap. 18, 30) even: in most of them, especially in the longer speeches, the scheme changes in accordance either with the subject (e. g. chap. 38 ff.) or the tone. Other very striking changes may depend upon a corruption of the text, but to explain them all upon this ground, and correct the text accordingly (Merx), is as indefensible as the correction of all verses which may appear too long or too short (Bickell). In this opinion of Dillmann's I entirely coincide.

In regard to verbal criticism, Siegfried has carefully consulted and judiciously used the works of his predecessors, especially the excellent edition and translation by Prof. Merx, which, published in 1871, was the first scientific recension of the Book of Job, and is still a most valuable book. In adopting the conjectures of other scholars, Siegfried displays great judgment and tact. To cite a few examples: Job 6, 8, שְׁאֵלֹתִי, in the first hemistich, corresponds to תִּיִּנֵּתִי in the second. The latter word does not suit the parallelism, and therefore Merx did not hesitate to admit into his text the conjecture תִּיִּנֵּתִי, which had previously been suggested: Siegfried, with critical tact, follows his example. 5, 3, Merx, on the basis of LXX: *καὶ ἐβρόθη*, and וַאֲבָרָא, emends the traditional וַאֲקָב into וַרְקָב, and Siegfried exhibits fine taste in adopting this emendation. 33, 13, Siegfried adopts the suggestion of Hitzig and Dillmann in reading דְּבָרָיִךְ instead of דְּבָרָיִי. The change is here inconsiderable, for, as Dillmann says (Comment., p. 285), the older forms of י and ך are very similar, and it is possible in no other way to obtain a sense which suits the context. Cf. Hitzig, Das Buch Hiob, etc., p. 245. On the other

hand, I feel inclined to support, against Merx and Siegfried, the ancient reading יִבְרְכֵנִי. Siegfried reads here, with Geiger (*Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 267 ff.), וְיִבְרְכֵנִי, and states that the correction is due to religious reasons. I believe that Dillmann is right when he says (*Comment.*, p. 5) that in this passage there is no question of cursing, but of careless forgetfulness of God through intoxication of the senses. The sons of Job were entirely absorbed in worldly pleasures, and paid no heed to God; or, as the German saying runs: "sie liessen Gott einen frommen Mann sein."

The frequent alterations made by Siegfried in the very corrupt text of Job are, in general, simple and judicious. Thus, he reads the Kéthlb instead of the Qêrê: 2, 7; 6, 2. 29; 7, 1; 16, 16; 21, 13; 24, 6; 26, 12. 14; 31, 11. 20; 39, 12. 27; 40, 17; 42, 2; 33, 21. In other passages he prefers the Kethlb to the Qêrê, e. g. 7, 5. 35; 14, 5; 15, 22; 26, 14; 38, 11. 12; 42, 10. 16. The pointing is changed in the following passages: 5, 27, where Siegfried, in accordance with LXX: ἀκηκόαμεν, points שָׁמְעָה; 6, 18. 25; 8, 3. 7; 9, 17; 10, 20; 16, 21; 17, 9; 18, 12. 18; 20, 20. 23b. 25; 22, 12. 21; 24, 12; 27, 19; 28, 15; 31, 32; 32, 11; 36, 17. 28; 38, 32; 41, 7. 25. Numerous emendations have been made and adopted by Siegfried, in accordance with LXX readings, e. g. 4, 16; 5, 5; 6, 4. 13. 25. 27; 8, 13. 17; 10, 8; 11, 17; 12, 2. 4; 14, 10; 15, 8; 16, 6. 11. 20. 35; 17, 6. 7; 18, 2. 3. 5; 19, 13. 29; 20, 2. 4. 18. 19. 20. 23; 21, 2. 3. 10. 13; 22, 9. 11. 12. 19. 29. 30; 23, 3. 4. 11. 12; 24, 2. 5. 16. 25; 25, 3; 27, 13; 28, 13; 29, 4. 24; 30, 18. 22; 31, 32; 33, 7; 34, 36; 38, 10. 20. 24; 41, 24.

The Syriac Version has also been frequently made use of for the emendation of the Hebrew text. Cf. 26, 12, where Siegfried, in accordance with נָשָׂא, and LXX: κατέπαυσε, changes נָשָׂא to נָשָׂא; 42, 6, אֶמְאֵס is changed, according to אֶשְׁתָּח; אֶשְׁתָּח, according to אֶשְׁתָּח; 39, 21, יִהְיֶה, according to חָפֵר, to חָפֵר; 18, 8, בְּעֶקֶב, according to בְּעֶקֶב, to בְּעֶקֶב; 18, 12, לִצְלָה, according to לְעֶצְאִי, to לְעֶצְאִי; 21, 4, הָאֲנִי, according to אִמֵּר, into אִמֵּר; 5, 11, יִשַׁע, according to Syro-Hex.: בִּישַׁע, to בִּישַׁע. All these emendations give evidence of the author's extensive and thorough knowledge both of Hebrew and the cognate languages, of the conscientious study which for many years he has devoted to Hebrew literature, and of his great acuteness. So also his conjectures, of which the following may be mentioned: 11, 18, וְחִסִּיתָ, in accordance with the parallelism וְיִבְרְכֵנִי; 15, 31, בְּפֶשֶׁת נִתְעַבָה, according to 19, 3, תִּתְחַבֵּר לִי; 23, 17, נִצְפַנְתִּי; 28, 4, בְּעֶפֶר; 31, 18a, מִנְעוּרָיו לְלִתְיָהוּ; 31, 18b, אִמָּה; 34, 33, שְׁלֹמִים; 40, 20, נְהָרִים; 41, 24, לְשִׁבְלִיו. See also 8, 17; 12, 21. 23; 15, 30. 31; 16, 15; 17, 10; 18, 8; 19, 17. 20. 23. 28; 20, 11. 26; 22, 20. 23; 23, 3. 13. 17; 24, 4. 18. 24; 27, 8. 23; 29, 10. 13; 34, 14; 38, 9; 39, 30; 40, 19. 24.

The clear print and magnificent get-up of the book deserve special commendation, and reflect great credit upon the publisher.

In conclusion some *errata* may be noticed, which Prof. Siegfried will not, I hope, take in the light of captious criticism, but rather as evidence of close reading. 6, 4 read יִעֲרֹכֵנוּ instead of יִעֲרֹכֵנוּ; 6, 8, תֹּאוֹת instead of תֹּאוֹת; 10, 20, מַעַט instead of מַעַט; 30, 10, רַחֵק instead of רַחֵק; 33, 7, תִּכְבֵּד instead of יִכְבֵּד. In the notes read p. 38, 12, l. 4 חֲרִיבָה; p. 41, 15 r. 16 נִצְפַנְתִּי.

Prof. Siegfried's valuable work merits the highest praise; and hoping that the English translation may soon follow, I wish the whole enterprise God-speed.

JENNA, January, 1894.

EUGEN WILHELM.

The Epistle of St. James: the Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Comments, by JOSEPH B. MAYOR. Macmillan & Co., 1892.

This book will be compelled to *make* its friends. The prepossessions started by the known scholarship of the author, and the renowned lucidity and precision of previous commentaries of similar exterior from the same publishers, meet with disappointment. Indeed, the mere fact that 468 octavo pages are devoted to an Epistle the text of which occupies less than seven in the edition of Westcott and Hort is ominously suggestive of the *μέγα βιβλίον κτέ.*; and the incipient apprehension is not allayed on finding that thirty pages are given to the question, Who were the Lord's 'brethren'? although discussions of it equally full and learned are acknowledged to be accessible. The robust good sense of the remarks about marriage (p. xxxiii sq.) will hardly compensate the average reader for the space they take; nor is he likely to be any more indulgent towards the wise lay sermons on 'respect of persons' in modern churches (p. 197 sq.), creeds (p. 202 sq.), pulpit tenure and the liberty of prophesying (p. 205 sq.), temptation (p. 175 sq.), regeneration (p. 186 sq.), and other topics treated at some length in the fifty pages given up to "Comment." Moreover, the 'Paraphrases' relegated to this section of the book he desiderates in the formal exposition.

But the reader's disappointment is not all occasioned by the circumstance that so much more has been given him than he expected. He wonders that an experienced teacher could bring himself to dislocate the text of the Epistle from the "Notes," and to print that text in separate verses although the Latin translations set over against it are printed in paragraphs. The practical embarrassment thus occasioned is augmented by the fact that the successive 'lemmata' of the Notes do not reproduce the Epistle in full. Further, the Greek text professedly followed in the main is that of Westcott and Hort; yet their careful attention to capitals, spacing and punctuation, as guides to the meaning, is disregarded. Indeed, the text as printed makes slight account of the niceties of scholarship: for example, the grave accent is used before a comma or before words quoted, in i. 27; ii. 3, 8, 10; v. 12; but the acute in i. 12; ii. 11 (*his*), 20; iii. 2, 8, 17 (*ter*). And this trivial bit of heedlessness has caused the editor not only to misquote, but probably to misinterpret, Westcott and Hort in his Note on v. 12 (p. 156), as a comparison of their text at Matt. v. 37 will indicate. In ii. 17 the *ν ἐφελκυστικόν* is omitted, in spite of the assertion on p. cliv that it is 'constant,' which assertion is itself too sweeping (covering, as it does, the *ς* in *οὕτως* also), as a reference to the N. T. Lexicon, pp. 421, 468, will show. In iv. 2 the reading *φανεύετε* is printed, but on p. 127 the reading *φθονεῖτε* is preferred (cf. too the Addenda, etc., p. xiii); in v. 20 *ψυχὴν* stands in the text (see also p. 244), but *ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ* in the Notes (and p. clxii sq.); and in the first word of this verse the form of one reading is adopted, but the accent of the other. In fact, the

printing can hardly have received the author's supervision throughout: on p. 24, for example, there are six omitted accents and breathings, besides the dropping of a desirable comma after *προφήτας* in verse 10.

But leaving external matters, the reader as he examines the volume soon finds himself querying for what class it was specially intended. The annotations are studded with untranslated quotations in Greek and Latin, and introduce occasionally a line or two from the German, as though the book were designed for scholars; but an entire chapter of the Introduction is devoted to the "Grammar of St. James," and more than eleven pages of that to the Article, beginning with "the simplest use." The treatment, too, is far from confining itself to the Epistle in hand: of the illustrative examples adduced, one hundred or more are taken from other books of both the Old Testament and the New. The Essay contains many apt remarks, serviceable enough to a beginner, but wearisome to an advanced student; and if the latter reads on, hoping to receive an expert's judgment on some of the controverted points of New Testament usage, he gets but little satisfaction. Whether, for instance, the presence or absence of the article with *νόμος* affects the noun's signification is a question, we are told, which "has been often debated"; but in the cases where the Revised Version has inserted the definite article in rendering the anarthrous Greek, the only approach to a decision is that "perhaps" an ambiguous rendering would have been more 'exact' or 'correct' (p. clix); and when the reader thinks he has come upon an unequivocal expression of opinion (p. 83, bottom), on turning to the passage referred to (iv. 11, p. 138), he encounters the rendering 'a law' and a back-reference (to ii. 8) where he is told it may be "used for the law of Christ or of Moses." The similar question respecting *πνεῦμα* and *πν. ἅγιον* is barely glanced at on p. clxv, although the usage with *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* is incidentally treated in another connection, p. 84. Once more, we read that "The use of the article with *πᾶς* is the same in the New Testament as in ordinary Greek" (p. clxvi), in apparent oblivion of or indifference to such phenomena as exercise the expositors in Eph. ii. 21; Acts xvii. 26, not to speak of the Septuagint.

The same query, as to what readers the author had in mind, recurs on turning to the chapters which treat of the "Apparatus Criticus" and the "Bibliography." The definition of the term Lectionaries, the remark about the value of ancient versions in determining the text, the cursorness of the description of the leading uncials, and the like, suggest primary regard to young students; but the unexplained use of such technical terms as palimpsest, recensions, Pre-Hieronymian, Pre-Syrian and Western texts, Alexandrian readings, etc., conflicts with the suggestion. Moreover, any reader might be perplexed to understand (p. ccxxiii) how Tischendorf's alleged over-estimate of cod. Sin. 'induced him to prefer an inferior reading' in iii. 5, 6; iv. 2, where the difference turns mainly on punctuation, although that manuscript, as the author tells us (not quite correctly), "is written continuously without stops."

The seven or more pages of Bibliography, too, with their occasional brief estimates and descriptions, would be a valuable aid to the inexperienced student, did not the author at one moment seem to presume in him an

expert's knowledge by contenting himself with the briefest designation, without place or date (e.g. Price, J., in *Critici Sacri*; Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae*, etc.), and the next moment give specifications of title, time and place, in the case of books familiar even to a tyro. The specifications given, too, are sometimes misleading, as though taken from the particular edition which happened to be at hand. Why, for instance, in the case of the late Dr. Lightfoot's Commentaries, should the date of the 10th edition (1890) of that on Galatians be stated, while the editions of Colossians and Philippians recognized were long ago superseded? Why attach the date 1842 to Bruder's Concordance and T. S. Green's Grammar, 1855 to Trench's Synonyms, 1866 to Westcott on the Canon, 1877 to Lightfoot's Clement?

A work which has furnished an avocation for years almost inevitably exhibits, besides the marks of deliberate and loving labor, some of those oversights and inconsistencies which beset studies prosecuted in scraps of time and varying moods. From such traces of oscitancy the book is not free. On p. clx, for example, we are told that "Buttmann is wrong," when the mistake is due to the author's inadvertently extending to *αὐτοῦ* (treated by Buttmann separately, §127, 20) a remark which the German grammarian expressly restricts to *ἡμῶν* and *ὕμῶν* (see §127, 21; p. 102 of the German, p. 116 sq. of the English translation). Again, p. 165, Lightfoot is associated with Alford in the assertion that *ἐνεργεῖσθαι* is never passive in the N. T., whereas he (like Fritzsche) expressly limits his statement to St. Paul's usage; nor does he imply that 'the active is exclusively confined . . . to the immediate action of a good or evil spirit'; so far from it, he himself (on Gal. ii. 8) cites one of the examples (Prov. xxxi. 12) adduced by our author in proof of the contrary.

Nor is Professor Mayor always careful to be consistent with himself. On p. 140, for instance, he says that *οἵτινες κτέ.* (iv. 14) is in apposition with the preceding *οἱ λέγοντες* vs. 13; but in the text, p. 20, it is separated from what precedes by a colon and included within the parenthesis. On p. 141 he adopts the reading *ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος θελήσῃ*, as he does in his text, p. 20; but on p. clxxix *ἐὰν [ὁ] Κύριος θέλῃ* (al. *θελήσῃ*). On p. cxvi he asserts "the absence of all allusion to Gentiles in the Epistle" (cf. pp. cxviii, cxx); on p. 95, "the supposition that the epistle is addressed principally to Jews." The phrase *καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης* is regarded as an echo of our Epistle both when it appears in Philippians i. 11 (p. xciv) and in Heb. xii. 11 (p. cii), but on p. clxiv its anarthrous form is ascribed to the fact that it is a 'proverbial expression' borrowed from the Old Testament (see also the Note on iii. 18). On p. li we are told that Clement of Rome calls Abraham *ὁ φίλος* "after St. James"; on p. 98 that Clement is "probably copying from St. James"; but even Professor Mayor's own quotation from Philo on the same page shows that the statement needs a still stronger qualification than "probably." On p. lxiv sq. four parallels to the language of our Epistle are adduced from Tertullian, three of which are marked as 'striking'; but on p. ccxxix the author seems to acquiesce in the opinion of Rönisch and Bishop Wordsworth that the Epistle "is not cited at all by Tertullian" (yet see again p. 164).

But these and similar blemishes seem to be due to what is the gravest fault of the book: its ill-digested character. The multifarious accumulations of

many note-books appear to have been emptied into it somewhat promiscuously. Almost everything which a student of the Epistle can possibly desire is there, but it must be looked for; *ζητεῖτε καὶ εὐρήσατε* would be a not inappropriate motto for the volume. No reader—(or reviewer, either)—can safely infer from the fact that a topic is handled in one place, that he is possessed of the author's full views upon it. For instance, a separate chapter is given, as has been said, to the "Grammar of St. James"; but in the next chapter, professedly devoted to the "Style of St. James," the first nine pages are occupied with remarks on his inflexion, syntax and vocabulary—including a page or two on constructions he does *not* use—while elsewhere (p. 39) we incidentally gather the additional information that "St. James has a fondness for verbs in -ιζω"—of which a dozen are forthwith registered. Nor can it be inferred with assurance that a topic has not received due attention because it fails to be found where it might naturally be looked for. For example, the arrangement of words in the Epistle is discussed in the chapter on Grammar, not in that on Style. On p. clxxv, in the section on "Voices," *καθίσταται* (iii. 6; iv. 4) is despatched with the comment 'doubtful whether passive or middle'; but in the Note on iii. 6 (p. 107) the passive is argued for decidedly. On p. clxxii *εἰς τό* with an infinitive is said to be used "of reference" and "of result and purpose"; but on p. 59 a more discriminating statement is made with appended examples, and a discrepant opinion (covering forty-two Pauline passages) from Professor Abbott is subjoined in a footnote. No notice is taken of the anarthrous *χεῖρας* in the Note on iv. 8; but its use is duly commented on, and parallels given, on p. clxiii. The somewhat unguarded statements on p. 88 about *τὸ ἔλεος*, and its associates, repeat what is given more fully (though not quite exactly) on p. cliv. And the use of the book is made irksome by the absence of cross-references, or by their indefiniteness when given. See "Essay on Grammar" (the common formula in the Notes) is hardly a considerate way of referring to the contents of thirty-odd compactly-printed octavo pages.

Notwithstanding all this fault-finding, however, great injustice would be done to the book if its conspicuous merits were not emphatically acknowledged. It evinces in its author a combination of sacred and secular scholarship as unusual as it is admirable. Probably in no other part of Christendom could such a book have been produced by such a man. The reader is once and again surprised at a knowledge, both Biblical and bibliographical, which would do credit to a specialist. Occasional slips occur, to be sure—such as the identification (p. xlix) of the Peshitto with the old Syriac version, and the assignment of it to "the beginning of the second century" (yet cf. p. ccxxvii). Nor do we always find the firmness of handling expected from the professional critic (see the remarks on the readings in iii. 3; iv. 2), or the neatness and precision demanded of the practised exegete (witness the *locus vexatus* iv. 5 sq., where all the learned research of the Note will fail to give satisfaction to a reader with even Tischendorf's or Tregelles's text in hand, to say nothing of Westcott and Hort's with its margins, but will leave him wondering where the author gets his "for the entire devotion of the heart" as the convenient object after *ἐπιποθεῖ*—more careful is his rendering on p. xcvi; the apparent confusion of *εἰμί* and *γίνομαι*, i. 22; the statement, ii. 21, that "*δικαιῶ* is strictly to

make i. e. pronounce just"; the blending of two distinct interpretations of τῷ κόσμῳ, ii. 5; etc.).

Of the treatment given to the very delicate questions belonging to the Epistle's "Introduction" there is not space left to say more than that, in estimating its attestation, the author seems to forget at times two things: first, that the possible is not always the probable, nor the probable the certain; and secondly, that not all the connections between the early Christians were literary. Moreover, besides the impatient good sense that breaks out in such a passage as p. cxlviii sq., there is occasionally a loftier bearing (e. g. p. cxxx sq.) than is altogether becoming.

But with all its present imperfections the book is a valuable addition to exegetical literature, and may be heartily wished such prosperity as shall speedily call for its reconstruction, that it may thus be rendered more thoroughly helpful to students, and a yet more worthy memorial of an eminent scholar. As a trifling contribution to this end a few *corrigenda* are here set down: p. lxiv, the apparent clash between *Sol. in Psalm.* cxviii. 6 and the reference to the same passage on p. 87, note, should be avoided by giving the twofold notation of the psalm (as does Lommatzsch); p. cxx, line 11, for misappropriate read inappropriate; p. clvii, line 13, for i. 12 read i. 11; p. clxiv, line 3, for v. 20 read v. 16; p. clxiv, line 9, for Amos vi. 2 read Amos vi. 12; p. clxviii, line 8, for 13 read iv. 13; p. ccxvii, for Sophokles read Sophocles; p. ccxviii, line 6, for Ultzen read ed. Ueltzen; p. ccxxiii, line 20 sq., for φλογιζομένη read φλογίζουσα; p. clxviii, line 3, p. 66, line 3, and p. 101, line 1, apodosis appears to be used for protasis; p. 72, line 22, for Ryle read Ryle and James; p. 72, line 6 from bottom, for Psalm. Sol. ii. 191 read Psalm. Sol. ii. 19; p. 84, line 15, for Luke i. 17 read Luke i. 72; p. 86, line 38, for p. 108 read p. 112; p. 138, the verse numeral 12 should stand before the preceding 'lemma,' viz. εἰς ἔστιν νομοθέτης; p. 153, line 7 from bottom, for Isa. xl. read Isa. xlv.; p. 155, line 37, for Plato, Rep. iii. 361 D read Plato, Rep. ii. 361 C.

J. H. THAYER.

BRÖRING, Quaestiones Maximianae. Münster, 1893.

This little dissertation on Maximianus' Elegies (two articles on which were published by the present writer in the American Journal of Philology for 1884) sets itself to prove that the Eton MS, which is now acknowledged to be the best conservator of the text of the poems, cannot be followed implicitly, or with the unhesitating confidence which Petschenig, in his excellent edition of 1890, was inclined to extend to it. Some twenty years ago I made a complete collation of this MS; in 1883-4 I followed this up by an enlarged examination of several other English codices—two in the Bodleian, the others in the British Museum. In my articles printed in the American Journal of Philology I have maintained the general superiority of the Eton Codex to all the others known as yet, but that there are some places in which it is undeniably wrong. This view is now reinforced by Bröring, but by no means so strongly as it might have been; thus, as regards the instances selected, to take his first instance, I 11:

Saepe poetarum mendacia †carmina finxi,

why should the prevailing reading of other MSS, *dulcia*, be preferred? The young Maximianus, amongst his other accomplishments, was a poet, and wrote verses like the rest of the fanciful tribe.

Again, I 157, 158 is thus given in E:

Et me que dudum, que nulla aduersa nocebant
Ipsa quibus regimur nunc alimenta grauant,

and in the excellent XI-XIIth-century Bodl. 38:

Et me quem dudum nulla aduersa nocebant,

whence the probable reading may be elicited

Et me quem dudum, quem nulla a. n.,

for Rönsch, *Italia und die Vulgata*, p. 441, proves that *nocere* was constructed with an accusative in the Latin of the Decadence. But if this is so, what becomes of the variants recorded on p. 15? They are interpolations and wrong, as is the re-constitution on p. 17.

The case is more complicated in I 239, 240:

Cumque magis semper iaceam uiuamque iacendo,
Quis sub uitali computet esse loco?

So E, but Bodl. 38 has *iaceas uiuasque*, with an equally good sense. Yet as E has a preponderating weight, Petschenig seems to me right in retaining the 1st person. Petschenig also retains *computet* = *putet*, supporting this not over-choice Latin by two passages from a very late writer. I am obliged to demur here, for the whole of the verse is obscure, and the change *non putet* of the slightest. But all the MSS seem to support E in giving *computet*; and though the case is doubtful, Petschenig did right in following E *in toto*.

Bröring propounds the following:

Cumque magis semper iaceat uiuatque iacendo,
Quis sub uitali non putet esse loco?

translating 'und wenn er immer mehr da liegt und so liegend sein Leben führt, wer sollte dann nicht glauben, *unter einem Orte des Lebens*, d. h. in der Unterwelt zu sagen?' Surely a very questionable meaning of *sub uitali loco*. A similar perverseness of interpretation occurs p. 21, in the line (I 271)

Tracta diu rabidi compescitur ira leonis.

Bröring, unable to stomach this *diu*, yet dissatisfied with Ommeren's *die* (and very reasonably), constructs *diu* with *rabidi*, against the natural suggestion of the passage. I have suggested in my *Noctes Manilianae*, p. 153, that *diu* in the v. of Maximianus and in Manil. IV 823 *Mutantur sed cuncta diu* means 'in longo ordine annorum': this is not certain, but the resemblance of the two passages is striking; whereas on Bröring's view *compescitur* either requires *per senium* to be supplied from the following v., or is too weak a word to stand by itself. The former alternative is that which he prefers; but it is against the ordinary practice of the poet.

I will now mention two passages where Bröring appears to me to have proved that E is at times wrong.

The most conspicuous case is perhaps V 59, where E has *uirilia*, other MSS *flagrantia*. A long syllable is required, and as Bodl. 38 gives *flagrantia*, the chances are that this is right. In V 79, 80, where E has *haec tamen ipsa*, B. makes it probable that *hoc tamen ipso* of BP (*hoc tamen ipse* Bodl. 38) is what the poet wrote.

But the cause of E is not promoted when our critic defends its reading in I 130:

Litibus haud rabidis commoda iura sequor

against *dura* of Bodl. 38 and most MSS; nor is it possible to believe that E has preserved Maximianus' line in II 64:

En uersus facio et †media dicta cano,

where Petschenig gives

En uersus facio et mollia dicta cano.

I venture to assert that nothing in the Elegies can be alleged at all so flagrant as a violation of prosody as this *mēdia*, or so improbable as diction, as the meaning assigned to it by B. is 'mediocria.' The MSS, however, differ greatly in the various forms of this verse; and it will do no harm to call attention to a recognized difficulty.

Equally objectionable metrically is B.'s reading of III 53, which E gives thus:

Dicite et unde nouo correptus carperis aestu?

B. would omit *et*, asserting that the hiatus 'offensionem non habet.' An attentive reader of the Elegies will find that no equally harsh hiatus exists in them anywhere.

On the whole, the dissertation, though not without cleverness, can hardly be thought to have effected much for the criticism of Maximianus. Its chief value is the attention it calls to E, and to the fact, which emerges with tolerable clearness, that though E is much the best MS, it cannot safely be trusted alone.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

Charaka-Samhita, translated into English, published by AVINASH CHANDRA KAVIRATNA. Calcutta, printed by D. C. Dass & Co., "Corinthian Press," 33 New China Bazar, and published at 200 Cornwallis street. (No date.)

The Hindu medical *Çāstras* are likely, in the immediate future, to advance into the foreground of Indological interests. The very important recent find of Lieutenant Bowers—the birch-bark MS discovered in the ruins of the ancient city of Mingai, near Kuchar, in Kashgaria—consists to a considerable part of medical materials, and throws a great deal of light on the chronology of medical science in India. Drs. Bühler and Hoernle, the first decipherers and interpreters of the Bowers MS, agree in placing it at least 500 A. D. (see Hoernle, Proceedings of the Asiatic Society, April, 1891; Journal, vol. LX,

part I, nr. 2, pp. 139 ff.; Bühler, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, V, pp. 102 ff., 302 ff.). Even a preliminary survey of the Bowers texts revealed many striking general correspondences with the medical works of Suçruta, Caraka, and the Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, and, later on, Dr. Hoernle discovered not only parallels, but literal correspondences between the second medical text in the Bowers MS and the works of Caraka and Suçruta,¹ so that the comparative antiquity and correct tradition of the chief medical books can no longer be doubted.

Under these circumstances, translations of the larger medical treatises assume an unusual degree of importance, since they facilitate rapid survey and prepare the way for final critical interpretation. An English translation of Suçruta by a native Pandit, Mr. Uday Chānd Dutt, has for some time been passing with stately slowness through the ever-welcome fascicles of the Bibliotheca Indica, and now another native scholar, Mr. Avinash Chandra Kaviratna, has undertaken, independently, a version of Caraka, of which five parts are in our hands. Mr. Kaviratna has had a prolonged experience in this type of literature, having previously edited, and translated into native vernaculars, both Caraka and Suçruta (Introduction, p. vii). The present translation bears evidence of a very extensive knowledge in this domain, of which 'all the works, if capable of being collected together, would fill a fairly large library.' The author offers an interesting theory to account for the extent of this literature. The basis of Hindu education has always been an extremely inexpensive boarding-school system. A guru, or teacher, has a few disciples whom he takes gratis: it is their duty to beg for him in the village, and somehow between them they manage to live. The teacher very frequently finds himself in the position to adapt his teaching to the personal equation of his particular group of disciples, and to compile abridgments of larger works and to embody his own experience for their benefit. He is thus led into authorship, and, if ambitious, he will before long desire to address the profession in general, through the medium of more pretentious compilations, or elaborate commentaries. But all these works receive from their authors fanciful poetical names and are foisted upon the literature as independent productions. Still, first and last, medical literature, in spite of all repetitions, evinces an astonishing range of observation, and here and there no mean therapeutic ability. The author believes that many diseases peculiar to India can be cured more effectually, cheaply and quickly by the aid of the intelligent native practitioner, relying on Caraka, than by pursuing Western systems of cure. Witness the following prescription for fever: "*Fast, sweating, time, gruel of barley, and decoctions of bitters, destroy all disorders and functional derangements in acute fever.*"

Mr. Kaviratna's work will not only be welcomed by Sanskritists, and of these especially by the students of the Atharva-Veda, and the house-customs (Grhya-sūtras); it will also be of great help to the students of the history of medicine, who will find this a source of information far superior to the antiquated, so-called Latin translation of Suçruta by Hessler (1844-50), or even to the much-consulted digest of Dr. Wise entitled 'Commentary on the Hindu System of Medicine' (1860).

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

¹ See Jolly in 'Festgruss an Rudolf von Roth,' p. 26.

ETHIOPIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The accomplished librarian of the National Library at Milan has placed the learned world under a heavy obligation by the publication of his *Bibliografia Etiopica* (di G. Fumagalli; 8vo, ix + 288 pp.; Ulrico Hoepli, Milano, 1893). The work includes all publications relating to Ethiopia which have appeared since the invention of printing up to the close of the year 1891, and was compiled under the joint auspices of the Italian Geographical Society and the Society for the Commercial Exploration of Africa. The bibliography is classified, the titles being arranged under the following subject-headings: Bibliographies; Biographies of Travellers in Ethiopia and of Ethiopic Scholars; Voyages and Explorations; Geography and Statistics; Topographical Descriptions and Special Explorations; Cartography; Linguistics; Literature; History and Archaeology; History of Eritrea; Religion, Liturgy, and Native Legislation; Ethnography, Costume, and Folk-lore; Meteorology, Climatology, and Medicine; Fauna; Flora; Geology, Mineralogy, and Palaeontology; Commerce, Industry, and Agriculture; Typographical History, alphabetic varieties; an appendix containing the most important works published during 1891, and an alphabetical list of authors.

2758 works are cited, a number which is swelled to 3428 when all editions and reprints are included. The preface contains a statistical table showing that Italian publications are most numerous, German, French and English following in the order named, with 57 titles credited to the United States. The arrangement and typography are in every way to be commended, and the annotations are made with much skill and discernment.

No. 1205, 'Remarks on the Ethiopic by G. H. S.' should be credited to George H. Schodde. Jonas Vates, *Ethiopice et Latine cum glossario*, 1706, noticed in a recent sale catalogue, seems not to have been included.

Fumagalli's work is supplemented by the *Bibliotheca Aethiopica* of Lazarus Goldschmidt (Leipzig, Eduard Pfeiffer, 1893; 8vo, pp. 63). This useful little book contains a list of all Ethiopic works published, with bibliographical and literary notes. The Ethiopic literature thus far published is by no means extensive, being limited to the Old and New Testaments, apocryphal books, lives of saints, liturgies, homilies, etc.

CYRUS ADLER.

REPORTS.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN. Herausgegeben von Dr. EUGEN KÖLBING, Heilbronn.

XVII. Band, 1892.

I.—Ten Brink, On the Chronology of Chaucer's Writings. The suggestion for this article Ten Brink finds in Koeppel's double statement that Chaucer's Life of St. Caecilia was written after the Troilus, and belonged to the same period as his translation of the De Contemptu Mundi. In opposition to Koeppel, Ten Brink argues that the Life of St. Caecilia must fall about the beginning of Chaucer's second period, and the prose translation not far from the years 1387-8. Koeppel had made Chaucer's imitation of Dante in the first three stanzas of the poem, and his use of the particles *forwhy* and *forthy*, the crucial tests for determining the date of the St. Caecilia. As regards the first, the question chiefly concerned Chaucer's omission of lines 13-15 (Paradiso, XXXIII 1-21), in which Dante implores the intercession of the Virgin. Koeppel maintains that the substitution of comparatively meaningless verses for these was due to the author's fear of repeating lines used in a different and worldly sense in Troilus. Ten Brink, on the other hand, lays the omission to the freedom and realism of Chaucer's thought, to which Dante's mysticism appealed but feebly. To this he adds that the whole passage is rather a free remodeling than an imitation of that of Dante. He takes as decided issue with Koeppel in the inference to be drawn from the use of the particles *forwhy* and *forthy*. They are, indeed, almost lacking in the Canterbury Tales. But, on the other hand, they are sparingly found in the works of the first period, and the use of both particles in fact culminates in Troilus and Boethius. By the application of this test Ten Brink concludes that Troilus, The Hous of Fame, and The Legende of Goode Women follow each other closely in the order named. These results he fortifies by a *résumé* of his earlier arguments as to the dates of the poems: Troilus, for its maturity of art and thought, must be dated toward the close of Chaucer's second period; the intimate connection between Troilus, The Hous of Fame, and The Legende of Goode Women leaves no doubt that they were written consecutively and without long interval; these poems are of such a character that a religious work like St. Caecilia could not be a link in the chain connecting them; the life of St. Caecilia shows so undeveloped an art that, on aesthetic grounds, it must be placed near the beginning of the second period; the introduction is evidently written by a young man; the St. Caecilia is the only poem of the second period that shows us Chaucer reproaching himself for a worldly life, for idleness and waste of time. It must then "belong to the beginning of the second period, and indeed to that part of it which lies before Chaucer's entrance into the custom-house. The poet who was overburdened with dry official business could not possibly have said of himself that he had

written the life of a saint to keep himself from idleness." From the prologue, indeed, which Ten Brink regards as a spontaneous expression of his mood, he would date the poem before June 8th, 1374.

The date of the *De Contemptu Mundi* is closely connected with those of the two prologues to *The Legende of Goode Women*. After a careful comparison of these, the author concludes that the first-known and more familiar version (the *Vulgata*) was written about 1385, while the one discovered by H. Bradshaw in the Cambridge library (Gg) is a later remodeling of the same. The fixing of the exact date of the newer version would demand a careful study of the inner history of the *Canterbury Tales*. "Here," says Ten Brink, "I limit myself to the statement, which will hardly meet with much opposition, that the Gg prologue must have been written soon after the so-called Headlink of the *Man of Lawes Tale*, and can hardly have come into existence before the year 1393." The dating of the prologues settles, at least approximately, that of the *De Contemptu Mundi*, which must have been written between the two. The circumstances of the years 1386-88 would, moreover, have naturally turned Chaucer's mind toward such a work. From all considerations it was most probably written in 1387 or 1388. The hold of Innocent's treatise on Chaucer's thought is proved by its giving a motive to the introduction of the *Man of Lawes Tale*.

Otto Zirwer, *Notes on the Middle English Romance Generydes*. These notes are based on Wright's edition of the poem (1873-78). Zirwer wishes not only to correct the text more consistently than Wright, but to apply to its study the results of more recent scholarship. These notes fill some twenty-five pages.

E. Kölbing, *Notes on the Textual Criticism of the Strophic Poem Generydes*. This article supplements the former by its application of metrical tests to the text criticised.

Paul Theodor Mitschke, *On Southey's Joan of Arc*. I. Few poets have left such abundant and available material for the study of their works as Southey. 'The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey,' by his son, the selections from his 'Letters of Robert Southey,' edited by J. W. Warter, and the autobiographical prefaces and notes to his various works, leave little mystery as to his methods. Mitschke's article begins with an account of the familiar circumstances under which the poem was composed. It then takes up the alterations made by Southey in the subsequent editions. Especially interesting is the omission in the second edition (1798) of the part of the second book originally written by Coleridge. The reason, given by Southey in a letter dated July 19, 1837, was, naturally enough, that Coleridge's style was not in keeping with his, and that the matter was inconsistent with the plan in which the poem was recast. The sources from which Southey drew his material were most various. Earlier poems on the subject suggested, however, little but the artistic value of the subject. Chapelain's epic (1659) and Voltaire's drama (1762) were severely criticised by the poet of the revolution. The poems and tragedies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were hardly worth consideration as works of art. The pantomime which he saw in London in the Covent Garden theatre could at most prove the popular

interest in the theme. But in any case, so painstaking a poet as Southey must have gone directly to original sources. Not only are the customs and chronicles of England and France pressed into the service, but the most various books are ransacked for illustrations of the manners and customs of the time. Selden's *Titles of Honour* (1614), Burney's *History of Music*, Grose's *Antiquities*, Montaigne's *Travels*, and Speed's *Theatre of the Empire of Great Britain*, were studied as faithfully as the histories for the light they threw on some local peculiarity. Allied to this critical accuracy is Southey's censorship of his own thoughts and expressions. In a note to the line "Worthy a happier, not a better love" (IV 477), he quotes Ovid's verse, "Digna minus misero, non meliore viro." To justify the phrase "entering with his eye the city" (VII 20), he calls to witness Silius Italicus (XII 567): "Nunc lentus, celsis adstans in collibus, intrat urbem oculis." The second part of the article treats of the character and underlying thought of the poem. It belongs to the rebellious season of Southey's youth, when he was most deeply moved by romantic and democratic ideas; its fundamental character is determined by the enthusiasm of the day for poetical and intellectual freedom. This phase of the subject the author sums up as follows: "If we must look on this animosity to despotism and false orthodoxy as the fundamental tone of the epic, the motto which Southey borrowed from Homer and placed at the beginning of his poem, εἰς οἰωνὸς ἀριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πατρὸς, appears in part ironical. The poet certainly admires the enthusiasm of a nation in its struggle to free the fatherland; but he is secretly angered at the thought of the blood that must be shed by the people in order that a worthless, heartless and immoral king may mount the throne. By laying the scene of this action in France he is able to scourge the conditions of his own land more fully. While attacking English royalty indirectly by exposing the shamelessness of the French king, he does not hesitate to pass the severest judgment on his own countrymen in his description of the past to which the history of England's conquest of France belongs."

Th. A. Fischer, *A Collection of Words and Phrases in the Dialect of North Ireland*. Irish dialects, Fischer reminds us, have been studied much less thoroughly than those of England and Scotland. Their peculiar interest may best be stated in a translation of his own words: "The north of Ireland, as far as dialect is concerned, is in a singular position. While in Donegal and the Mourne Mountains the Celtic language is still commonly spoken, in the counties of Monaghan, Tyrone and Armagh, and even more signally in those of Antrim and Down, there remain clinging many old Scotch expressions of everyday life that in Scotland itself have long passed out of use." In the list of dialectic words and phrases are a number that have passed into colloquial or vulgar English.

Joh. Ellinger, *Is it Desirable to read Lamb's Tales from Shakespeare in Our Schools?* In answering this question the author considers only the fidelity of the Tales to Shakespeare. Of the six plays to which he applies this test, *The Merchant of Venice*, *King Lear*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Tempest* are recommended for the use of pupils who cannot read Shakespeare easily in the original. For *Hamlet* and *Macbeth* they must go, if help is necessary, to German translations.

Among the Book Notices are reviews of Kaluza's edition of Libeaus Desconus, of Shuckburgh's edition of Sidney's *An Apologie for Poetrie* (1891, from the text of 1595), Philippsen's *On the Character and Use of the Definite Article in King Alfred's Prose*, Hüllweck's *On the Use of the Article in the Works of Alfred the Great*, Fricke's *The Old English Numeral*, Bock's *Syntax of the Pronouns and Numerals in King Alfred's Orosius*, and Jellinek's *The Myth of Hero and Leander in Poetry*. Koeppel closes his review of Shuckburgh's edition (he does not seem to know mine) with these words: "*Zu Bubonax* (p. 175) wäre nach deutschen begriffen Albert S. Cook's artikel in der Academy n. 926 zu citiren gewesen." Robert Boyle's introduction to Gelbcke's *The English Stage in the Time of Shakespeare* is adjudged the best brief survey in German of the development of the English drama.

The Miscellanea contains an interesting fragment of Robert Manning's *Chronicle*. The sympathetic biography of Ten Brink by Koeppel is followed by a chronological list of his publications. Glöde points out some striking parallelisms in the poems of Thomas Gray and Heinrich Heine.

II.—E. Koeppel, *On the Chronology of Some of Chaucer's Writings*. In this article Koeppel defends the dates of *The Life of St. Caecilia* and the *De Contemptu Mundi*, attacked by Ten Brink in the preceding number of *Englische Studien*.

W. Franz, *Syntax of Early Modern English*. I, II. Franz bases his study of English syntax on the writers of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The present numbers treat of the relative and personal pronouns. They are interesting to every student of language both for the lucid presentation of their subject and for their many well-chosen examples.

J. Klapperich, *Comparison of the Adjective in Modern English*.

Besides others of less importance, the Book Notices contain reviews of Riegel's *The Sources of W. Morris's 'The Earthly Paradise,'* of Buchner's edition of the *Historia Septem Sapientum*, and Dick's edition of the *Gesta Romanorum*—both from the Innsbruck manuscript, and both included in the *Erlanger Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*—and of two parts of the *New English Dictionary*. A severe criticism of Knortz's *History of North American Literature* closes with an unflattering picture of the intellectual condition of America. Our state is one of hopeless intellectual mediocrity. "The narrow spiritual horizon, the ceaseless leveling, the blessings of an all-equalizing 'pure democracy,' excessive ecclesiasticism without any deep religious feeling, the lack of high culture, the luxuriance of a worthless newspaper literature which answers the necessities of the moment, the morbid preference for the sensational—all these have strongly influenced American literature. One may say that a nation of sixty-two million people produces only weak sugar-and-water poems and journalistic articles, that the drama is wholly dead, and that, with few exceptions, the *volkslieder* consist of street songs. The small number of scholars, who fortunately do exist, receive no small share of their inspiration from 'effete and dying Europe,' from England, Germany and France, and bear no proportion to the mass of the people. Genius *vacat*, but even talents are far too few."

This number of the Miscellanea is rich in contributions toward the elucidation and text-criticism of Modern and Middle English poems. Kölbing contributes valuable notes on the textual criticism of the poems contained in Wülker's Old English Reader. Preussner gives a number of notes on Robert Manning's Chronicle, Sprenger suggests various emendations in the readings of Peele's King David and Fair Bethsabe, and gives some interesting references to the sources of Byron's Bride of Abydos and Longfellow's Autumn, Tales of a Wayside Inn, and Miles Standish. Wülfling has collected a number of valuable examples illustrating the use of Old English *sum* with the genitive of number. The account of the fifth session of the Association of Modern Philologists (Berlin, January 7, 8, 9, 1892) shows the influence of current German educational discussion.

III.—O. Lengert, The Scottish Romance Roswall and Lillian. In this number Lengert gives an account of the various manuscripts of the old romance, an analysis of its contents, and an enumeration and brief description of related European sagas. Legends showing more or less striking points of resemblance are found in Tartary, Servia, Russia, Italy, Poland, Germany, Bohemia, Norway, Bosnia, Albania and Greece, as well as in England and France. These stories are divided into two main groups. With the smaller of them, containing the Tartar, Russian, Servian, Polish and Italian tales, the author chiefly concerns himself. The article concludes by a consideration of the artistic value of the Scottish romance, and an analysis of its dialect, metre and vocabulary.

W. Sattler, English Collectanea: (1) The Germanic and the French Mode of Numeration. Sattler has collected many examples showing English usage in reference to such forms as *one and twenty*, *twenty-one*, which he discriminates as Germanic and French respectively. Those from the various versions of the Bible are especially interesting.

W. Franz, On the Syntax of Early Modern English. In this article Franz continues and concludes his treatment of the pronouns. The complete article will be of much value to students of the subject.

E. Nader, An Attempt to use Phonographic Texts in English Teaching. It is needless to say that this method has proved most effective in economizing the teacher's energy and power.

The Book Notices contain, among others, reviews of Skeat's Twelve Facsimiles of Old English Manuscripts, of Davidson's Phonology of the Stressed Vowels in Beowulf, of Bluhm's The Autobiographical in David Copperfield, and of Sweet's Shelley's Nature-Poetry. Of Davidson's paper Karsten says: "The paper contains not only much honest work, but also earnest thought and good judgment. The arrangement is so transparent that every question relating to Beowulf vocalism finds its prompt answer by a glance at the respective paragraph, so far as stressed vowels are concerned."

This number of the Miscellanea is devoted to Lord Byron and Miss Elizabeth Pigot, Byron and Dupaty's Letters on Italy, and to an account of the lectures on English Philology and kindred subjects in the universities of Germany, Austria and Switzerland in the year 1891-92.

XVIII. Band, 1893.

I.—R. Sternberg, *On a Middle English Chronicle in Verse*. The author considers first the chief manuscripts and the phonological peculiarities of the two versions of the chronicle, designated respectively as A and R. Then follows a brief treatment of the metre. The verse is the four-stressed riming couplet, and is very freely handled. The rime and alliteration of the two versions are carefully compared.

P. Th. Mitschke, *On Southey's Joan of Arc*. II. The aesthetic criticism of Southey's *Joan of Arc* is prefaced by a brief account of its reception. The favorable judgment of contemporaries was, indeed, little due to the artistic excellence of the poem. The dearth of contemporary poetry, the romantic nature of the subject, and the revolutionary spirit in which it was written, more than account for its popularity. This Southey clearly stated in the preface to the edition of 1837 (p. 23). "But the chief cause of its favorable reception was that it was written in a republican spirit, such as may easily be accounted for in a youth whose notions of liberty were taken from the Greek and Roman writers, and who was ignorant enough of history and of human nature to believe that a happier order of things had commenced with the independence of the United States, and would be accelerated by the French Revolution. Such opinions were then as unpopular in England as they deserved to be; but they were cherished by most of the critical journals, and conciliated for me the good-will of some of the most influential writers who were at that time engaged in periodical literature, though I was personally unknown to them. They bestowed upon the poem abundant praise, passed over most of its manifold faults, and noticed others with indulgence." The aesthetic value of *Joan of Arc* is tried chiefly by Southey's requirement that the hero of an epic poem should be the character that chiefly holds the reader's interest. Judged by his own standard, Southey has failed; not Joan, but Conrad, forms the central interest of the poem. The heroine is deficient both in intense passion and in the absence of any real moral struggle. She thus becomes a mere puppet in the hands of fate or providence, and is interesting only when her simplicity of character and purpose is brought into contrast with natures more sensitive and complex than her own. Conrad, whose feelings are more various and conflicting, holds our sympathy far more continuously and completely. He is, besides, a more essential part of the play. We can think of him without Joan, but not of Joan without him. "He is the dark background against which appears the bright form of the Maid as she passes him. Without this background she would dissolve into a broad sea of light, which after a time could only pain and blind us." An interesting point treated by the author in discussing this poem is the peculiar character of Southey's romanticism. In all that he wrote appeared his predilection for the romantic; all the material that he sought for his muse bore the imprint of his romanticism. But while Scott was inspired by Germany and found material in the ballads and romances of his native land, Southey went to the most distant and foreign sources for his inspiration, to Spain and France and Mexico and Arabia and India. In *Joan of Arc*, however, his romanticism is comparatively simple and familiar, and pleases us far better than do the far-fetched allusions, the exaggerated pathos, and the strained fancies of some of

the later poems. In conclusion the author ranks Joan of Arc with Roderick as Southey's best work. When considered in relation to European poetry it takes an even higher place; Southey's epic and Schiller's drama are the two great representations of one of the greatest of the romantic themes.

K. Breul, *The Modification of the Mediaeval and Modern Languages Tripos in Cambridge*. In response to the demand of schools, students, and the faculties of the University, this reform of the Mediaeval and Modern Languages Tripos was announced by the senate of Cambridge University October 17, 1891. As there is in England no Minister of Instruction, the task of examining the old system and of making recommendations for its improvement was put into the hands of a 'Special Board for Mediaeval and Modern Languages.' The recommendations of this Board, which, with few modifications, were accepted by the senate, were the result not only of long study, but of consultation with specialists outside the Board. The new regulations concerning the conditions of the degree and the papers to be set in each of the six sections of the Tripos are given in full. The conclusions may best be given in a translation of the author's words: "If we compare the original regulations for examination with the new one, we reach, in the main, the following results. The chief points criticised in the old programme have all been considered and, as far as possible, done away with. The arrangement of the sections and their relations to one another are entirely altered. The examination itself is longer and more searching. It embraces, aside from the oral examination, which is not obligatory, six days (thirty-six hours). The demands in the different departments are made as nearly as possible equal to one another, English especially approximating to German. For the first time, means are provided for a wholly independent study of *Anglistik* and *Germanistik*. Almost every paper shows indications of the change in a better nomenclature as well as in the better ordering of the regulations. English now heads the list. 'Anglo-Saxon' is replaced by 'Old English,' and 'Moeso-Gothic' by 'Gothic.' Unfortunately, 'Teutonic' (instead of 'Germanic') is still retained. . . . The greatest gain in the demands for a more thorough preparation consists in the granting of a fourth year of study, while it is still to be proved whether the long-desired admission of students from other triposes can be called a real gain. In this historical and classical philologists have been especially considered. From what has been said it is evident that the new course is more elastic than the old, and better suited to the tastes of different natures." Among the good results certain to follow the change at Cambridge, the author dwells on its influence on the other universities. He says: "In none of the higher institutions of learning has the study of modern languages hitherto been so carefully organized as now in Cambridge, and the experience of Cambridge with the new system will in the future, if the sister institutions are at last forced to yield to the stream of time and follow her example, be of the most wide-reaching significance for Oxford, Victoria University, and perhaps for the University of London."

H. Klinghardt, *New Methods of Language-Teaching Abroad*. The European demand for better methods makes the teaching of languages a question of European interest. From this point of view the author reviews the important books on the subject published in the chief nations of Europe. Russia is

represented by one book, Denmark and Sweden by four each; other countries by various numbers. Sweet's Second Middle English Primer is the English book noticed. From Charles F. Richardson's articles (School and College, vol. I, pp. 386-97) are taken several quotations of interest to all students of philology. The first concerns the great value of the comparative method in the teaching of Old English, another the danger of losing a sense of literature in the study of linguistic philology.

Among the Book Notices are reviews of Earle's *The Deeds of Beowulf*, Fleay's *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, Sarrazin's *Thomas Kyd and his Circle*, Kaluza's *Chaucer and the Romance of the Rose*, and Andrews's *The Old English Manor*. Of Earle's *Beowulf*, Koepfel praises the comprehensive notes, which are drawn from the many-sided reading of a highly cultured man. Homer, modern slang, and the text of the *Mikado* are alike used to illustrate the poem. Koepfel finds the notes the most valuable part of the work. The translation is at least in part injured by the mixture of archaic and "very modern, sometimes trivial" expressions. Of these *youngsterhood* (*geogoð*, v. 409) and the *racket* (*beahtm*, v. 1431) are the most striking. Boyle declares that, in spite of the vast collection of facts, a review of Fleay's book, which should be of any value, must "not only contain all the misprints and mistakes in the work, but also expose all the arbitrary conclusions which Fleay has incorporated into his material, as if they were ascertained facts." (See p. 112.) This he attempts to do for the plays he knows best—those of the Massinger-Beaumont-Fletcher group.

In the Miscellanea are some interesting notes by Varnhagen and Sprenger on *The Tales of a Wayside Inn* and others of Longfellow's poems, and a further discussion by Jellinek and Fränkel of the former's article on *Hero and Leander* (*Englische Studien*, XVII).

II.—M. Kaluza, *Thomas Chestre, Author of Launfal, Libeaus Desconus, and Octovian*. The first step in deciding the authorship of the three romances is to ascertain their relation to the older *Sir Landavall* or *Lanval*. The data needful for the decision were only given when G. L. Kittredge published the better text of the poem in the *American Journal of Philology* (X, 1889). The argument, based on a careful study of the parallel passages, the verbal coincidences, and the stanzaic structure of the poems, is briefly as follows: Chestre had taken the general plan and action of his *Launfal* directly from the older poem, but had added to it many beautiful episodes and descriptions. The three poems are undeniably by the same author; of these, *Launfal* is the earliest, *Libeaus Desconus* the second, and *Octovian* his last and greatest work. The argument is presented with singular lucidity and vigor.

W. Franz, *On the Syntax of Early Modern English*. This article deals with the adverb. Especially interesting are the illustrations of the adjective form of the adverb common in Shakespeare and through the whole sixteenth century. Our 'talk big' finds its counterpart in Bacon's 'to speake great.' But where so much is interesting, the article itself must be studied.

The Book Notices contain reviews, among others, of Kellner's *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, Bright's *Anglo-Saxon Reader*, Haeckel's *The*

Proverb in Chaucer, and Kölbing's Byron's *Siege of Corinth*. The choice of texts, the glossary, and the metrical analysis of Bright's *Reader* are highly praised. The review of Kölbing's edition of the *Siege of Corinth* is suggestive as to the study of the modern poets. Especially important is the account of his treatment of metre: "Here for the first time is the attempt made to obtain a scheme, already often applied to the investigation of Middle English texts, for the alliteration of Byron's poems." The results are not, indeed, wholly satisfactory. "The most of the alliterative formulas are not found in Old and Middle English. Yet they are not all new creations of Byron's. Many of them are found in other poets, but our present metrical knowledge does not enable us to ascertain exactly the origin of the various forms."

The department of *Miscellanea* is more interesting than usual. Reichel contributes notes to the textual criticism of Sir Fyrumbras, and Kellner to the syntax of *Ipomadon*. Sprenger calls attention to some curious echoes of Milton in Goethe's *Faust*. The old ballad, *King John and the Abbot of Canterbury*, is elaborately discussed by Hoenig. The short biographical notice of Taine is accompanied by an appreciative criticism of his writings. In spite of the lack of appreciation for him in Germany, the author insists that his profound philosophy, his historic insight, his psychological intuition, his great and varied learning, and his literary and artistic power are extremely rare in historians of literature. The name that he places beside him is that of Ten Brink, "the other great historian of English literature."

III.—W. Hulme, 'Blooms' of King Alfred. Under this title the author gives the text of the Old English translation of *Flores ex libro soliloquiorum D. Augustini Hipponens*. A brief account of the date of the writing and of the several manuscripts is prefaced to the text.

R. Sternberg, *A Middle English Chronicle in Verse*. This article deals with the sources of the two forms of the chronicle and with their relation to each other. As to the latter point, Sprenger concludes that A is a later work than R. How far the author changed the original chronicle from which he drew, it is impossible to prove without a more perfect knowledge of manuscripts. The Albin prologue is certainly peculiar to A. The chief source of R is unquestionably Robert Gloucester's *Metrical Chronicle of England*, and especially a manuscript copy of the same, which belongs to the class marked by Wright *αβγδε*. Besides this, the author was probably acquainted with Layamon B and Wace, and perhaps with Geoffrey of Monmouth. In many of his facts, such as the lengths of the reigns and the burial places of the kings, he differs widely from the other chronicles of the times. The sources of A are various: The story of Albin is taken from a French lay *Des grauntz Jiauntz*, etc. (*Jubinal*, Rec. II 354); The Dedication of Westminster is the versified form of a Latin treatise, *De Dedicatione Eccl. Westmon.* (Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* I, n. 537). The story of Hengist is invented after the analogy of later events; that of Cassibalan is amplified in the same way. Hine goes back to an unknown source; the story of Lancelot differs from that of the familiar Arthurian legend, and is largely the work of imagination. Edmund's Death is a free rendering of the *Martyr Saga of Edmund*. Inge is either the transcription or a poetic remodeling of a folk-saga, with use of the Rowena

episode in RG; Richard's Expedition to Palestine is taken from a version of the romance Richard Coeur de Lyon. The story of John has not yet been traced to its source.

As to the literary qualities of the two authors, R is tolerably dry and matter of fact, and is content to give a literal representation of his authorities; he seldom expresses, as in the case of Edelwolf's Peter's Pence, his own opinion. A, on the contrary, tries to make his work interesting. He inserts romantic stories, and himself writes poetry of the romantic character. But no less than R, he loses interest as he draws near to the history of his own time. Moreover, he shows a special love of London and of the peculiar local traditions of that city.

J. W. Hales, *The Date of the First English Comedy*. A chief problem of the historian of the English drama is, according to Hales, "to arrange the surviving fragments of the early Tudor drama in a more precise order of time than is at present possible, and to make clear the condition of our theatre when it was brought into close contact with the works of Plautus and Seneca." To this end he gives many, and apparently conclusive, arguments in favor of dating Ralph Roister Doister after 1546, instead of between 1534-41. The evidence may be summed up thus: the third edition of Wilson's *Rule of Reason* (1553) used, in order to illustrate 'Ambiguity,' the famous letter from Ralph Roister Doister to Mistress Kit Custance. If Wilson had known of it earlier he would most likely have used it in the editions of 1550 and 1552; but that he, an old pupil of Udall's at Eton, had not known of it, if it was written between 1534-41 or 2, is incredible. This is made even more unlikely because of the friendly relations of the two men, which are proved by the commendatory verses contributed by Udall to Wilson's *Rule of Reason*. These arguments are still further strengthened by the fact that about 1552 Udall was in such high repute as a dramatist that he is mentioned as having set forth 'Dialogues and Interludes' before Queen Mary. The internal strengthens the external evidence. The points of likeness between the play and Heywood's *Proverbs* (1546) indicate a date later than 1546. The references to usury, especially the line

Fifteen for one, which is too much of conscience

would seem to show that the Act of 1546, if not that of 1552, had been passed. Another strong point in favor of the later date is the more natural interval that would thus exist between this and the later comedies.

W. Franz, *On the Syntax of Early Modern English*. In this article the conjunction is treated with the fullness and clearness that makes this whole series so valuable.

Among the Book Notices are reviews of Bright's *Gospel of St. Luke*, of Liebermann's *Consiliatio Cnuti*, of Brown's *Language of the Rushworth Gloss*, and of Borkowsky's *Sources of Swift's Gulliver*.

The Miscellanea is wanting.

ALBERT S. COOK.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXI (1892).

Janvier.

On entering upon the third decade of their joint labors as editors of the *Romania*, MM. Paul Meyer and Gaston Paris, in an article addressed 'A nos lecteurs,' take a comprehensive survey of the work entered upon by them twenty-one years ago and still so vigorously prosecuted. The exceptional character of this retrospective paper invites to considerable fulness in the indication of its contents. After calling attention somewhat apologetically to the fact that the editorial contributions have constituted more than one-quarter of the twenty volumes of the *Romania*, the editors proceed: "Il y a vingt ans, la France occupait dans le monde une position bien modeste, pour la science comme pour le reste, et elle en avait le sentiment peut-être exagéré. Les études romanes notamment, prises dans leur généralité, y intéressaient peu de personnes. L'étude plus spéciale de notre langue et de notre littérature était poursuivie par un petit nombre d'érudits dont les travaux avaient peu d'action sur le grand public et n'en avaient aucune sur l'enseignement officiel. Trois chaires seulement, réparties entre le Collège de France, l'École des Chartes et l'École des Hautes Études, toutes trois, par conséquent, placées à Paris et en dehors de l'Université, représentaient en France certaines branches de la philologie romane. Au même temps l'Allemagne était considérablement en avance sur nous, tant par la place qu'elle accordait à l'enseignement historique des langues et littératures néo-latines que par le nombre et l'importance des travaux qu'elle leur consacrait. Nous avons voulu que notre pays devint à son tour un centre d'étude et de production pour la philologie romane en général, et plus particulièrement pour la philologie française. . . . Notre domaine, restreint de plus en plus à la période ancienne de la philologie romane et spécialement de la philologie française, s'est, par certains côtés, singulièrement agrandi depuis vingt ans. A mesure que les découvertes vont se multipliant, l'horizon s'élargit et l'on voit mieux combien il reste encore à trouver. Des rapports imprévus s'établissent entre les œuvres qui semblaient isolées. L'analyse linguistique est parvenue à un point de perfection que l'on entrevoyait à peine lorsque nous avons commencé la *Romania*. On arrive peu à peu à dater de temps et de lieu, au moins approximativement, les compositions anonymes qui abondent dans notre ancienne littérature. On a pu récemment tenter, avec chance de succès, de dresser le tableau chronologique de la littérature française jusqu'au XIV^e siècle: on n'y eût pas songé il y a vingt ans. Bientôt, à mesure que la langue de chaque auteur ou de chaque ouvrage sera en quelque sorte condensée en des glossaires spéciaux, on parviendra à grouper ensemble les écrits anonymes d'un même auteur. Notre champ d'études reste donc, pour ainsi dire, illimité. Mais, à côté des recherches originales, nous devons réserver une place suffisante à l'examen des travaux d'autrui. Nous le disions dans notre programme de 1871: 'La critique des ouvrages qui paraîtront dans le domaine de nos études sera une partie importante du recueil.' Et cette partie devient de plus en plus considérable, à mesure que la philologie romane va se développant en tous les sens. Nous sommes inondés de livres, de périodiques, de dissertations pour le doctorat allemand (dont beaucoup pourraient sans dommage être pré-

sentées en manuscrit), de contributions à telle étude, de suppléments à telles recherches. C'est une marée montante qui menace de restreindre la part consacrée dans notre recueil aux études originales. On voudra bien nous excuser si trop souvent de bons livres n'ont pas le compte rendu qu'ils méritent, et si l'analyse de tel ou tel périodique est en retard. C'est que ce genre de travail ne peut être confié au premier venu. La critique exige une expérience et, s'il est permis de le dire, un tour de main, qui ne sont pas communs. Et puis les jeunes érudits de notre temps ne semblent pas avoir pour cet exercice salutaire le goût que nous manifestions, lorsqu'en 1865 nous fondions la *Revue critique*."

A. Thomas. La loi de Darmesteter en provençal. In his study of the "protonique non initiale, non en position," Darmesteter refrained from considering the bearings of the question on the Provençal. Prof. Thomas points out a series of cases in the latter language in which pretonic vowels other than *a*, contrary to their destiny in French, survive. We are able to set up for the Provençal a very simple rule: substantives corresponding to verbs in *-ir* have *i* as pretonic derivation-vowel (*sentir, sentimen*), those pertaining to verbs in *-ér, -er* or *-re* have uniformly *e* (*tener, tenemen*). This state of affairs is here accounted for on the theory that these words have never attained an independent status, have never, so to speak, "coupé leur cordon ombilical." "Ce qui se transmettait d'une génération à l'autre, c'était non pas les mots eux-mêmes, mais bien plutôt le procédé pour les faire."

H. Morf. Notes pour servir à l'histoire de la légende de Troie en Italie et en Espagne. I. Guido delle Colonne et Darès. II. Une nouvelle version italienne (Version *F*). III. Le roman de Landomata.

P. Meyer. Maître Pierre Cudrifiu, horloger, et la ville de Romans (1422-31). Incidents in the life of a certain bourgeois of Fribourg, entitled 'magister horologiorum,' whose correspondence with the syndics of Romans apropos of a clock erected by him for their town furnishes autographic documents of interest.

P. Meyer. Ballade contre les Anglais (1429). This *ballade* (to mention here only an incidental point) begins: "Ariere, Englois coñez, ariere!" A note explains that "Anglici erubescunt *caudati* vocari." In the legend of St. Augustin, the people of Dorset are said to have insulted this saint by fastening fish-tails to his garments. The saint cursed them, and since then the English are *caudati*.

Mélanges. Pio Rajna. A cosa si deva la conservazione testuale dei Giuramenti di Strasburgo (How the Oaths of Strasburg came to be textually preserved). In this study, which is elaborate enough to constitute a principal article, Prof. Rajna points out that we owe the rather surprising textual preservation of what is thus far the earliest specimen of the Old French language, on the one hand, to the fact that the history of Nithardus is a contemporary document dealing in particulars rather than in general considerations, and, on the other, to the circumstance that the part of the narrative in which the oaths occur was written shortly after the accomplishment of the facts involved and at a moment when the historian happened to have an

abundance of time at his disposal.—F. Lot. *Le mythe des Enfants-cygnés*. Compares with the Romance forms of this myth an Irish legend which offers striking analogies with it at certain points.—F. Lot. *Le Chevalier au Lion: comparaison avec une légende irlandaise*.—Egidio Gorra. *La Novella della Dama e dei tre papagalli*. Adds to the versions published in the Romania, vols. XVI and XIX, still another form of the story, as found in MSS preserved at Turin and Paris.—F. Novati. *Un' Avventura di Peire Vidal*.—P. Meyer. *Le conte des Petits Couteaux d'après Jacques de Vitri*. An *exemplum* omitted by Professor Crane in his edition of the *Exempla* of Jacques de Vitri.—P. Meyer. *Coussin*, ancien provençal et français *coissin*. Derived from *coxinus* < *coxa* 'thigh,' the cushion being destined to be placed under the thighs.—Louis Havet. *Peaigne*. A brace for the foot, from Lat. *pedanea*.—A. Delboulle. *Perpetuon*.—A. Bos. *Porpos, propos*. "Ne peut venir de *propositum* (Littré, Brachet, Scheler), qui aurait donné *porpost*. *Propos* est le substantif verbal de *proposer*, comme *repos* l'est de *reposer*."—A. Bos. *Aisil*. From *acetulum*, diminutive of *acetum*.

Comptes rendus. Egidio Gorra. *Testi inediti di storia trojana, preceduti da uno studio sulla leggenda trojana in Italia* (H. Morf). 19 pages. "Ce livre est le fruit de longues recherches. Il contient beaucoup d'inédit, outre les textes, qui n'en remplissent qu'un tiers. . . . En résumant, dans les pages qui suivent, le contenu de ce gros livre, j'accompagnerai ce résumé de remarques de détail."—L. Constans. *Le roman de Thèbes* (P. Meyer). "Il est douteux que les résultats obtenus soient en proportion du travail si pénible que s'est imposé l'éditeur."—W. von Zingerle. *Floris et Liriope*: altfranzösischer Roman des Robert de Blois (P. Meyer). Robert de Blois was distinctively a man of letters, well versed in the Latin authors studied in his time, especially Ovid. He is the "poète courtois par excellence." The present edition is shown to be not wholly satisfactory.—K. Vollmöller. *Laberinto amoroso*: ein altspanisches Liederbuch (A. Morel-Fatio). "Il faut remercier M. Vollmöller de nous avoir rendu, en édition correcte, ce recueil précieux."—M. Gaster. *Chrestomathie roumaine: Textes imprimés et manuscrits du XVIe au XIXe siècle* (E. Picot). The publication of this collection, on which Mr. Gaster has been engaged for ten years, may be regarded as an event by all who are interested in Roumanian studies. Detailed review.

Périodiques. In his report on the *Zeitschrift für rom. Phil.*, Gaston Paris discusses the so-called historical infinitive (*Et grenouilles de se plaindre*), Tobler's emendation of a controverted passage in Dante's *Convivio*, and Foerster's etymology of French *prône* and of *prodrom*.

Chronique. W. L. Holland, professor of Romance languages and literatures at the University of Tübingen, died August 23, 1891, at the age of 69 years. Holland is chiefly known for his studies on Chretien de Troyes and on Spanish literature.—Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, who was chiefly occupied with studies on the Basque, but whose researches also extended to the Romance languages, died at Fano, November 3, 1891, aged 79 years. He was the son of Lucien Bonaparte, brother of Napoleon I. He had been deputy from Corsica to the Constituant Assembly and Legislative Assembly, and in 1852 was made senator. After the fall of the Empire he lived mostly

in England. In the Romance field his name is associated with a collection of translations of the Gospel of Matthew into various Romance dialects, chiefly Italian, and with phonetic investigations in numerous Italian and Spanish patois. He was one of the first to apply method and precise phonetic notation in the study of patois.

Livres annoncés sommairement (24 titles).

Avril.

G. Raynaud. *La Chastelaine de Vergi*. 49 pages. A new, critically established text of this charming poem of 958 verses, with preliminary study.

A. Neubauer and P. Meyer. *Le roman provençal d'Esther*, par Crescas du Caylar, médecin juif du XIV^e siècle. 34 pages. The circumstances and results of this study are of a peculiarly interesting nature. While at Oxford, Mr. Meyer had his attention called by Mr. Neubauer to a manuscript in Hebrew characters but composed in a language unknown to the latter, which proved on investigation to be Provençal. Mr. Meyer, in his turn, was unacquainted with Hebrew. Following is a part of Mr. Meyer's account of the joint procedure of the two scholars: "M. Neubauer me lisait un texte qu'il ne comprenait pas, tandis que je m'efforçais de saisir au vol et de transcrire les paroles que j'étais incapable de lire, et auxquelles je faisais subir les modifications que l'usage de l'alphabet hébraïque permet, déplaçant les consonnes, substituant *i* à *e*, *u* à *o*, *f* à *p*, *d* ou *z* à *r*, etc., ou réciproquement, jusqu'à ce que le sens se révélât. C'était la collaboration du paralytique et de l'aveugle." By this method of restitution, 448 lines of the Provençal poem are here presented, face to face with the Hebrew transliteration, together with notes and glossary. Although only a portion of the poem was recovered, the discovery is one of the most important of recent years in the domain of Provençal studies.

Paget Toynbee. *Christine de Pisan* and Sir John Maundeville (printed in English). The author discovers that in one portion of her '*Livre du Chemin de long estude*' (vv. 1191-1568), Christine has made use of the '*Travels of Sir John Maundeville*.'

G. Weigand. *Nouvelles recherches sur le roumain de l'Istrie*. All that was known heretofore of the Istro-Wallachian dialect, spoken by some three thousand villagers, is collected in the '*Rumunische Untersuchungen*' of Franz Miklosich. The author extends the information there given, and appends translations of brief texts face to face with the originals.

Mélanges. L. Mirot. *Valbeton dans Girart de Roussillon*. Identified with Vaubouton, between Vézelay and Pierre-Perthuis.—G. Paris. *La Chanson à boire anglo-normande parodiée du Letabundus*.—G. Paris. *La traduction de la légende latine du Voyage de Charlemagne à Constantinople par Pierre de Beauvais*.—A. Longnon. *Nouvelles recherches sur Villon*.—A. Thomas. Jean Castel.

Comptes rendus. *Romanische Bibliothek*, herausgegeben von Dr. Wendelin Foerster, vols. I-VIII (G. Paris). Prof. Paris passes in review the first eight volumes of this new collection. "Malgré ces critiques, qui ne portent en

somme que sur des détails d'exécution, la Romanische Bibliothek est digne de toute estime et mérite d'être vivement recommandée à tous ceux qui s'intéressent aux langues et aux littératures romanes du moyen âge."—J. Salverda de Grave. *Eneas: Texte critique* (G. Paris). Minute criticism, covering fourteen pages. "La publication du roman d'Enéas était souhaitée depuis longtemps; le volume de M. de Grave justifie tout ce qu'on en entendait."—G. Rauschen. *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert* (G. Paris). "La publication de M. Rauschen . . . apporte une contribution des plus importantes à l'histoire politique, religieuse et littéraire."—E. T. Kuiper. *Karel ende Elegast* (G. Paris). Mr. Kuiper's edition of this curious little poem renders a service to Romance as well as to Germanic studies.—Notices et extraits des mss. de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques, publiés par l'Institut national de France, tome XXXIV, première partie (P. Meyer).—E. Forestié. P. de Lunel, dit Cavalier Lunel de Montech, troubadour du XIVe siècle, mainteneur des jeux floraux de Toulouse (P. Meyer). Offers many emendations.—J. Pichon and G. Vicaire. *Le Viandier de Guillaume Tirel, dit Taillevent, enfant de cuisine de la reine Jehanne d'Evreux, queu du roi Philippe de Valois, etc.* (S. Luce). "Les étrangers prétendent, non sans malice, que nous avons joui de tout temps, en cuisine, d'une suprématie moins disputée que dans les autres domaines où notre action a pu s'exercer. Or, le *Viandier* de Guillaume Tirel ou, comme disaient nos pères, le *Taillevent*, car le sobriquet du queux, dont l'œuvre si populaire servit de modèle pendant des siècles à toutes nos *Cuisinières bourgeoises*, était devenu un nom commun, le *Taillevent* est le monument le plus antique et le plus vénérable de cette suprématie."

Périodiques.

Chronique. Adolphe Gaspary, professor of Romance languages at the University of Breslau and author of the excellent *Geschichte der italienischen Literatur*, which is left incomplete, died March 18, 1892, aged 43 years. Shortly before his death he had received a call to Göttingen. Carl Appel has been invited to fill the vacancy at Breslau, and A. Stimming that at Göttingen.—James Stürzinger, formerly professor of Romance languages at Bryn Mawr, has been elected 'extraordinary' professor at Tübingen.—V. Crescini has been elected professor of the comparative history of the neo-Latin languages and literatures at Padua.

Livres annoncés sommairement (38 titles).

Juillet.

W. Meyer-Lübke et G. Paris. La première personne du pluriel en français. 24 pages. Meyer-Lübke summarizes all the leading theories heretofore advanced as to the origin of the termination *-ons*, and pretty conclusively establishes the more or less current view that it is a generalization, for all the tenses of all verbs, of the single form *-umus* occurring in one tense of one verb (*sumus*). To the second part of the article Gaston Paris prefixes the following statement: "Je veux seulement revenir sur quelques points accessoires et esquisser rapidement, autant que nous pouvons nous la représenter, l'histoire de la propagation, en français, de la terminaison *-umus* au delà de son domaine originaire."

G. Huet. Les fragments de la traduction néerlandaise des *Lorrains*. 39 pages. Of the various mediaeval literatures, that of the Netherlands seems to have been the only one that possessed a translation of the extensive cycle of the *Lorrains*. Of this translation only fragments are preserved. After giving a bibliographical list of these fragments, the author treats his subject under the following main heads: 1. Analyse des fragments conservés; 2. Plan du poème néerlandais; 3. Comparaison avec les versions françaises; 4. Sources et caractère de l'original français perdu.

Mélanges. G. Paris. *Bascauda*. A word 'britannique' known to Martial and Juvenal, in the sense of *large basin*, from which Paris derives Old French *baschoe* (*bascauda*) and Mod. Fr. *bâche* (*bâscauda*), whence English *basket*, through a probable French diminutive *baschete*.—G. Paris. *Longaigne*. Properly a term of monastic architecture < *longanea* < *longum*, a translation of Μάκρων, name of a celebrated portico at Constantinople. The word *longanea* came to be used euphemistically in the sense of 'latrines.' "Les latrines, dans les couvents peuplés, occupaient de véritables galeries, placées en dehors de la maison, et souvent sur l'eau."—G. Paris. *Boute-en-courroie*. This phrase, which has been an old-time puzzle to the lexicographers, is here explained as a sort of three-card-monte trick, only that it is worked with a strap. The sharper who plays the game is also designated by the same term. "Diabolus . . . est sicut ille qui ludit de corrigia, qui vocatur *boute en corroie*, qui facit ibi ad terram duos laqueos, et dicit: 'Ponam tecum quod nunquam poteris ita figere digitum tuum quin quando traham ad me corrigiam sis extra, et nunquam intra.'"—P. Meyer. Fragment de la *Vengeance de Raguidel*.—A. Jeanroy. Sur deux chansons de Conon de Béthune.—A. Thomas. *Le Mystère de la Passion à Saint-Flour en 1425*.—A. Piaget. Remarques sur Villon, à propos de l'édition de M. A. Longnon.—A. Piaget. *La Quistione d'amore* de Carlo del Nero.

Comptes rendus. Ernest Langlois. Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose (Charles Joret). "Suivant pas à pas son auteur, M. Langlois a mis en lumière, avec une grande perspicacité, les emprunts que celui-ci a faits à près de quarante auteurs, tant de l'antiquité que du moyen âge, parmi lesquels figurent au premier rang Ovide, Boèce, et Alain de Lille. Mais que d'autres noms il cite dans sa patiente énumération! Aristote, Cicéron, Virgile, Horace, Suétone, Solin, Macrobe, Geber et Roger Bacon, Jean de Salisbury, Alhazen, Huon de Méry, etc., passent tour à tour sous nos yeux."—P. J. Rousselot. Les modifications phonétiques du langage étudiées dans le patois d'une famille de Cellefrouin (Charente). Thèse française.—De vocabulorum congruentia in rustico Cellae-Fruini sermone (A. Thomas). Thèse latine. The most remarkable portion of the former of these works is the chapter entitled 'Méthode graphique appliquée à la phonétique.' "Pour écrire un travail de ce genre il fallait des connaissances en physique que possèdent bien peu de linguistes de l'heure présente et qui s'imposeront sans doute de plus en plus aux linguistes de l'avenir." The following statement of the author himself concerning this chapter is especially noteworthy: "Les conclusions de cette première partie sembleraient appeler des modifications importantes dans la graphie de mon patois. Toutefois je résiste à la tentation de les faire. Comme elles échappent toutes au contrôle de mon oreille, je serais exposé à

une foule d'erreurs. Je continue donc à écrire mon patois comme je l'entends." —Goddard Henry Orpen. *The Song of Dermot and the Earl*, an Old French Poem (P. Meyer). "C'est assurément la meilleure publication d'ancien français qui ait été faite jusqu'à présent par un Anglais. Mais ce n'est même pas dire assez, car les rares éditions de textes français ou anglo-normands que nous devons aux savants anglais sont souvent bien peu recommandables." In a footnote Mr. Meyer adds: "Il faut cependant faire une exception en faveur de la 'Vie de Saint Auban' de M. R. Atkinson, un irlandais comme M. Orpen." —J. Ulrich. *Les Merveilles de l'Irlande*: texte provençal (P. Meyer). "Ce n'est malheureusement pas la première fois que M. Ulrich s'acquitte d'une manière insuffisante des tâches qu'il s'impose."

Périodiques.

Chronique. Giovanni Flechia, Italian senator, and professor at the University of Turin, died July 3, 1892, at the age of 80 years. "Flechia était indianiste de profession, mais c'était aussi un romaniste de premier ordre." —Professor Schuchardt, of Graz, having published a note in the *Litteraturblatt für germ. u. rom. Phil.* calling upon linguists to unite, in order to avoid ambiguity, in using the signs < and > to mean respectively *whence* and *from* (Ital. *cuore* > Lat. *cor*), various scholars have published protests against this interpretation and employment of the signs in question, which, as it appears, were independently introduced at about the same time (1870) by Prof. Francis A. March and Karl Verner, and have ever since been used, with almost universal agreement, in the sense opposed to that championed by Schuchardt. [Prof. S. continues, in his numerous and highly valuable contributions to philology, to disregard what has been shown to be the accepted usage.]

Livres annoncés sommairement (23 titles).

Octobre.

P. Meyer. *L'Image du Monde*, rédaction du ms. Harley 4333.

A. Thomas. *Aise*, essai étymologique. 22 pages. Masterly study, deriving this much-discussed word from Lat. *adjacens*. Ital. *agio* and Port. *azo*, which do not accord with this etymology, are presumably loan-words.

F. Novati. *Le Livre de raisons* de B. Boysset, d'après le ms. des Trinitaires d'Arles actuellement conservé à Gênes.

P. Meyer. *Les manuscrits de Bertran Boysset* (premier article, avec facsimilé).

A. Piaget. Une édition gothique de Charles d'Orléans.

Mélanges. G. Paris. *Mastin*. Not from *mansionatinum* (*canem*) (Diez), but from *mansuetinum* (cf. *consuetudinem* > *costume*). —G. Paris. *Antenois* (< *antinesem* < *antinum* < *annotinum*). —P. de Nolhac. *Le Gallus Calumniator* de Pétrarque. —A. Thomas. *Le théâtre à Paris et aux environs à la fin du XIVe siècle*. —A. Thomas. *Jean de Sy et Jean de Cis*. —A. Piaget. *Michaut* pour *Machaut*. —Paget Toynbee. *Estaler*. Derives this word and Eng. *stale*, in sense both of 'uriner' and of 's'arrêter,' from Germ. *stal*, Anglo-Saxon *steal*, Eng. *stall* (cf. A. J. P. XII 239).

Périodiques.

Chronique. Eduard Mall, professor of Romance and English philology at the University of Würzburg, editor of the works of Marie de France and other Old French texts, died in March, 1892, aged less than 50 years.—Reinhold Köhler, librarian at Weimar and most eminent scholar of his time in the comparative history of folk-tales, died April 15, 1892, aged 62 years.—The death of Ernest Renan, October 2, 1892, at the age of 69 years, suggests the propriety of reminding the general public of his important contributions to the history of Mediaeval French and Provençal literature, contained in several volumes of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*.

Livres annoncés sommairement (27 titles).

H. A. TODD.

BRIEF MENTION.

The elder Kipling's 'Beast and Man in India' is introduced by an apt quotation from Walt Whitman: 'I think I could turn and live with animals, they are so placid and self-contained.' But apart from the philosophic calm engendered by contemplating the animals, 'by standing and looking at them long and long,' no nationality can be understood without knowing its attitude towards certain familiar creatures, and 'Beast and Man in Greece,' properly handled, would be an interesting theme. A right-minded person may refuse to accept the moral of a fable and cast contempt on the wisdom of a proverb. Every ἐπιμύθιον is a nuisance, and the fewest proverbs may not be read backwards as well as forwards. But the student of life must take an interest in the *dramatis personae* of fable and proverb, must ask himself questions as to the social position of the dog in Greece and the social position of the ass. If the Greek γαλή is not our harmless, necessary cat, but a half-domesticated, flippant weasel, then a great gulf is fixed between our home life and that of the Greeks. For the appreciation of a people it matters much whether their lion be a real lion or a menagerie lion or an heraldic lion. A horse is one thing to a Tartar and another to a Venetian. And so monographs that throw light on this and that poor brother of the animal kingdom are always welcome. A thoroughly competent American scholar, Professor MORGAN, of Harvard, has recently earned our gratitude by making us better acquainted with an important character in Attic life through his translation of XENOPHON *On Horsemanship* and his admirable notes and illustrations (Boston, Little, Brown & Co.). Some years ago the book of KELLER on the dove was read with great interest by all scholars. And it was from no want of good-will that I did not notice at the time of its appearance a dissertation by BAETHGEN *De vi ac significatione galli in religionibus et artibus Graecorum et Romanorum* (1887), in which the author has brought together some important facts concerning that fine creature, which has been so vulgarized in modern times that it is hard to reproduce the Greek admiration of the 'Persian bird.' No poet of to-day would dare to draw his figures from the cockpit, and Mr. Freeman, who sneered at Pindar's ἐνδομάχας ἀλέκτωρ, would have sneered at Ion's description of the heroic death of a gamecock:

θάνατον δ' ὅγε δουλοσύνας προβέβουλεν.

One of the latest contributions to this department of ancient life is a treatise *De apium mellisque apud veteres significatione et symbolica et mythologica*, by WALTER ROBERT-TORNOW (Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung), a store-house of entertaining facts which ought to be made accessible to that wider public which will not look for this kind of diversion in the precincts of the Latin tongue. In these days of 'sugar trusts' we are apt to forget how important was honey in the time when there was no sugar; and as honey is

largely manufactured now, comb and all, it is hardly possible to be filled with religious awe in contemplating it, and so it is well to be reminded that, from the cradle to the grave, the life of the Greek was compassed by an Oceanus of honey. The first food given to the new-born child was honey; and to the passages collected by Robert-Tornow I would add Soranus, *Gynaec.* 86: *δεῖ δὲ τῷ δακτύλῳ τὸ στόμα τοῦ βρέφους ἡρέμα διαχρίειν εἰτα χλιαρὸν ὑδρόμελι παρενστάζειν.* Honey was one of the constituents of the funeral libation, and the bodies of the dead were preserved in honey. As to the bee itself, whose natural and mythological history is given in charming detail, our 'Bienenvater' makes the somewhat cynical observation that if the ancients had observed the sexual life of the bee more closely, the 'flower-worker' would not have been selected as an emblem of purity and chastity; but as it appears from his own statement that even modern observers are ill-informed on the subject, it would have been as well to leave our faith undisturbed. It is the only note that jars in the attractive volume.


Some years ago, as I was returning from the performance of the *Acharnians* at Philadelphia, one of my fellow-travellers shyly ventured the remark that if the *Acharnians* was to be considered a typical Greek comedy, then Greek comedy might be a jolly nursery play, might be a bustling farce to amuse children, but was scarcely the thing for grown-up people. Now, I am of Rabelais' mind, of Goethe's mind, as to the discernment of the smaller sex in all such matters, and it was one of the smaller sex that made the remark. In some respects, it is true, the *Acharnians* is not a typical Greek comedy. Zieliński would say it lacks the *ἀγών*, and, in fact, as compared with the *Knights* it has no organization, as compared with the *Lysistrata* it is disarticulate; and yet, as the plots of the other plays passed through my mind, I was not certain that any of them would find favor with one familiar only with the modern stage; and so, after making such an exposition of the matter as was possible under the circumstances, I laid the thing up in my heart, saying sadly to myself: "So to the clear eyes of this woman Rhadamanthys, our adored Aristophanes is little better than a monkey. *καλὸς τοι πῖθων παρὰ παισίν, αἰεὶ καλός.* Nay, a monkey without even an organ-grinder to give some semblance of rhythm to his antics." And then somewhat fiercely: "And is she to blame, when scholars actually edit Aristophanes without doing anything to show that he was an artist, without doing anything to show that he is aught to them except a poor punster, a broad jester, a grotesque farcer; capable, it is true, of splendid invective, capable, it is true, of lyric sweetness; but a supreme artist—hardly." We have all seen children pick up Chinese fire-crackers that had failed to go off by reason of a defective fuse, break them in two, and apply a match in the hope of bringing out a little fizz, a little spurt; and so we may fairly say that to some people Aristophanes is a string of just such dead fire-crackers, out of which scholiasts and annotators try to elicit a faint semblance of fun. Now, I do not consider myself inaccessible to a joke. If I were, I should hardly be the American I am; and, in fact, I may claim to have made special studies in Aristophanic jokes: I have codified them and paralleled them, and have, in fine, done my duty by them. Nay, I have tried

to extend the sphere of them, and am very far from carrying the owl of serious politics into every part of this citadel of Athenian wit and humor. But Aristophanes is poetry, Aristophanes is art, and should be interpreted as poetry and as art; and editions like Dr. MERRY's *Wasps* (Macmillan) and the rest of them, which refuse to consider the form, which do not give a *conspectus metrorum*, much less hint at the meaning of the shifting metres, fall very far short of what is due to the great genius of the poet, the great skill of the artist. To him that hath ears to hear, every metre, from entrance to exit, has its significance. It is not meaningless that the chorus of the *Acharnians* begins with the trochaic tetrameter and passes over into passionate cretics, that the chorus of the *Wasps* begins with the iambic tetrameter and falls soon after into caterwauling. 'The *Thesmophoriazusae* and the *Ecclesiazusae* have no cretics, the *Nubes* practically none, and their range is philosophic and artistic mainly.'¹ That is no accident, and no loving student of art will fail to listen for just such keynotes, to note just such silences. To be sure, we shall be told, as we have been told, that 'it is idle to adduce literary and metrical considerations, as to which taste and fancy may legitimately differ,' in support of this or that interpretation; and it is true that even Shelley was capable of using the vulgar iambic tetrameter amid the glories of his 'Prometheus Unbound'; but, if all this be imagination, imagination has its rights in the interpretation of works of imagination, and without imagination poetry is a dead thing as poetry. It may be profitable for correction, for instruction in righteousness; and this is one great function of poetry which the Greeks themselves valued; but we must also remember that *ὁ τι καλὸν φίλον αἰεὶ* was not spoken of the soul alone. But beside the metres there is the dramaturgy to be considered, and whether Zieliński is right or not, no editor of Aristophanes can afford to ignore him. The question of the *ἀγών* is one that has to be met. At the same time, it is fair to add that in his fourth edition of the *Frogs* (1894), KOCK calls Zieliński's theory 'a problematic innovation,' but even he admits the importance and suggestiveness of the investigation, and does not dare ignore it, although 'practical considerations' have prevented him from substituting the new order for the old.

The death of the most eminent of American philologists, WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY, took place on the seventh of June, after the pages of this number were closed, and there is only space left to record the departure of a scholar who, in the midst of his manifold labors, showed not only by kindly expressions but by active help his interest in the establishment and in the prosperity of this Journal, as well as his personal friendship for the Editor, a fellow-student of the Berlin days of 1850. The press of the country, daily and weekly, has been full of tributes to the greatest student of language that ever rose on American soil, and it is fitting that THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY should set apart a space for a memorial to one who vindicated the right of Americans to a share in the processes of the philological thought of

¹ See my remarks in J. H. U. Circulars, Aug. 1883, based on Dr. Miller's figures.

the world, and showed in all that he wrought the unmistakable stamp of the American genius. Arrangements have been made, therefore, to secure for the next number of the Journal a fit record of the work of his life as a man and as a scholar, so that the opening of a new university year may be signalized by the estimate of what we have lost in the withdrawal of so active a force from the domain of American scholarship, and of what we have gained by the abiding influence of his precepts and his example.



RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Curtius Rufus (Q.) Selections; with vocabulary, notes and exercises; ed. by F. C. Smith. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 141 pp. 16mo, cl., net 40 cts.

Euripides in English Verse: Medea, Alcestis and Hecuba, by A. S. Way. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 3 v. 12mo, pap., @ 50 cts.

— Bacchae; with introd., text and notes; ed. by A. H. Cruikshank. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. (Clar. Press Ser.) 16mo, cl., net \$1.

Strabo. Selections from; with an introd. on Strabo's life and works, by Rev. H. F. Tozer. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 376 pp. 8vo, cl., net \$3.

Tertullian. De praescriptione haereticorum; ad martyras; ad Scapulam; ed. with introd. and notes by T. Herbert Bindley. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 180 pp. 12mo, cl., net \$1.60.

Theocritus; tr. into English verse by Ja. H. Hallard. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1894. 11 + 146 pp. 8vo, cl., \$2.

Thucydides. The Fall of Plataea and the Plague at Athens; from Thucydides II and III; ed. by W. T. Sutthery and A. S. Graves, with map, notes, etc. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. 132 pp. 16mo, cl., net 40 cts.

ENGLISH.

Bell's Classical Translations: The Bucolics of Virgil, The Georgics of Virgil. Tr. by A. Hamilton Bryce. Cr. 8vo, sd. *G. Bell & Sons.* ea. 1s.

Cicero. Ad T. Pomponium Atticum. Book 4. With notes, etc., by J. Brown. Cr. 8vo, limp. *Swan Sonnenschein.* 1s. 6d.

Homer's Iliad. Book 24. Ed. with notes, etc., by Walter Leaf and M. A. Bayfield. 18mo, 126 pp. *Macmillan.* 1s. 6d.

Sophocles. Oedipus at Colonus. Closely translated from the Greek. An experiment in metre by Arthur Compton Auchmutry. Cr. 8vo, 80 pp. Hull, *Andrews. Simpinkin.* 2s.

— Plays and Fragments. With critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose. By R. C. Jebb. Pt. 6. The Electra. 8vo, 324 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 12s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Darmesteter (Arsène). Cours de grammaire historique de la langue française. 2e partie: Morphologie, publiée par les soins de Léopold Sudre. In-12. *Delagrave.* 2 fr.

Nizam Oul-Mouk. Siasset Namèh, traité de gouvernement composé pour le sultan Mélik-Châh par le visir Nizam Oul-Mouk. Traduit par Charles Schefer. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.

Virmaitre (Ch.) Dictionnaire d'Argot fin de siècle. In-12. *Charles*. 6 fr.

Viteau (l'abbé Joseph). Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament. Gr. in-8. *Bouillon*. 12 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien. Hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. E. Bormann. 10. Hft. gr. 8. Prag u. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. L., *G. Freytag*.—10. Die Reisen des Pausanias in Griechenland. Von Rud. Heberdey. v, 116 S. m. 2 Karten. m. 10.

— germanistische, begründet v. Karl Weinhold, hrsg. v. Frdr. Vogt. 9. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *W. Koebner*.—9. Daniel v. dem Blühenden Tal, e. Artusroman v. dem Stricker, hrsg. v. Gust. Rosenhagen. xii, 206 S. m. 9.

— Berliner, zur klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. I. Bd. (In 5-6 Hften.) gr. 8. B., *R. Heinrich*.—I 1. Palaephatea, scripsit Dr. Johs. Schrader. 60 S. Subskr.-Pr., m. 1.20; Einzelpr., m. 1.60.

Acta martyrum et sanctorum. (Syriace ed. Bedjan.) Tom. IV. gr. 8. xv, 668 S. Parisiis. L., *O. Harrassowitz in Komm.* m. 24.

Aly (F.) Geschichte d. röm. Litteratur. gr. 8. xi, 355 S. B., *Gaertner*. m. 7; geb., m. 9.

Anthologia graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea, ed. H. Stadtmueller. Vol. I. Palatinae libr. I-VI (Planudeae libr. V-VII). 8. xli, 419 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 6.

Aristophanes, ausgewählte Komödien. Erklärt v. Thdr. Kock. 1. Bdchn.: Die Wolken. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. 227 S. B., *Weidmann*. m. 2.40.

Auctoris, Incerti, de ratione dicendi ad C. Herennium libri IV, edidit Frdr. Marx. gr. 8. vi, 554 S. L., *B. G. Teubner*. m. 14.

Ausgaben u. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie. Veröffentl. v. E. Stengel. 91. Hft. gr. 8. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* —91. Diez-Reliquien, zusammengest. u. hrsg. v. Edm. Stengel. iii, 48 S. m. 1.20.

Ausonius (Decimus Magnus). Die Mosella. Hrsg. u. erklärt v. Carl Hosius. Anh.: Die Moselgedichte des Venantius Fortunatus. gr. 8. vii, 100 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.40.

Beiträge, Münchener, zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. H. Breymann u. E. Koepfel. VII. gr. 8. Leipzig, *A. Deichert Nachf.* —VII. John Lyly and Euphuism, by Clarence Griffin Child, M. A. xli, 123 S. m. 2.40.

Bieler (Johs.) Ueb. die Echtheit der Lucianischen Schrift De Saltatione. Progr. gr. 8. 24 S. Wilhelmshaven. L., *G. Fock*. m. —80.

Borchardt (Wilh.) Die sprichwörtlichen Redensarten im deutschen Volksmunde. 2. Aufl., hrsg. v. Gust. Wüstmann. gr. 8. x, 534 S. L., *F. A. Brockhaus*. m. 6; geb., m. 7.

Brockelmann (Carol.) Lexicon syriacum. Praefatus est Th. Nöldeke. (In 10 fasc.) Fasc. 1. Lex.-8. S. 1-80. B., *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 4.

Büchner (Wilh.) Ueber den Aias des Sophokles. Progr. 4. 18 S. Offenbach. L., *G. Fock.* m. 1.20.

Caesaris (C. Iulii) commentarii ex recensione Bern. Kübleri. Vol. II. Commentarii de bello civili. Ed. maior. 8. 1, 153 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. —90; ed. minor (153 S.), m. —60.

Catonis (M. Porci) de agri cultura liber, M. Terenti Varronis rerum rusticarum libri III ex recensione Henr. Keilii. Vol. II, fasc. 1. Commentarius in Catonis de agri cultura librum. gr. 8. xii, 194 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 6.

Cicero's 4. Rede gegen Verres (v. den Kunsträubern). Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. Martin Fickelscherer. 8. xi, 119 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* m. 1.

Commentationes philologiae Ienenses, edd. seminarii philologorum Ienensis professores. Vol. V (finis). gr. 8. iii, 242 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 6.

Dieterici (Fr.) Arabisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zum Koran u. Thier u. Mensch vor dem König der Genien. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. iv, 183 S. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 6.

Dionis Cassii Cocceiani historia romana. Ed. I curavit Ludov. Dindorf, recognovit Ioa. Melber. Vol. II. 8. iv, 481 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.60.

Dreher (Thdr.) Kleine Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache m. Uebungs- u. Lesestücken. gr. 8. viii, 118 S. Freiburg i. B., *Herder.* m. 1.50; Einbd. in Leinw., m. —30.

Dunbar (Will.) Poems; edited with introductions, various readings and notes by J. Schipper. 5th part. [Aus "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss." Imp.-4. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.*—5. Anonymous Early Scottish Poems, forming a supplement to the Poems of W. D. S. 387–524. m. 7.

Enenkel u. Pinto. Neues deutsch-portugiesisches u. portugiesisch-deutsches Taschenwörterbuch. 12. 583 u. 559 S. Paris, *Gebr. Garnier.* Geb., m. 4.80.

Euripides, ausgewählte Tragödien. 2. Bdchn.: Iphigenie auf Tauris. Erklärt v. F. G. Schöne u. H. Köchly. 4. Aufl. Neue Bearbeitg. v. Ewald Bruhn. gr. 8. vi, 191 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. 2.40.

Firmici Materni (Iulii) matheseos libri VIII. Primum recensuit Carolus Sittl. Pars I. Libri I–IV. 8. xvi, 246 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 2.40.

Fredrich (Carl). De libro περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου pseudippocrateo. Diss. gr. 8. 32 S. Gottingae. Jena, *H. Pohle.* m. —80.

Ganzenmüller (Carl). Beiträge zur Ciris. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol.," 20. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8. 107 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.20.

Goetzeler (Ludw.) Animadversiones in Dionysii Halicarnassensis antiquitates romanas. Pars II. gr. 8. 92 S. München, *Th. Ackermann.* m. 2.40.

Grammatici graeci recogniti et apparatu critico instructi. Partis IV, vol. II. gr. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner.*—IV 2. Theodosii Alexandrini canones, Georgii Choerobosci scholia, Sophronii patriarchae Alexandrini excerpta, recensuit et apparatus criticum indicesque adiecit Alfr. Hilgard. Vol. II. Choerobosci scholia in canones verbales et Sophronii excerpta e Characis commentario continens. cxxxii, 526 S. m. 22.

Grasserie (Raoul de la). Langues américaines. Langue puquina. Textes puquina. Avec texte espagnol en regard, traduction, vocabulaire et essai de grammaire. Lex.-8. 67 S. L., *K. F. Koehler's Antiquar.* m. 2.50.

Hartmann (Mart.) Die hebräische Verskunst nach dem metek sēfatajim des 'Immānū'el Fransiis u. anderen Werken jüdischer Metriker. gr. 8. viii, 100 S. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* m. 2.50.

Hartung (Osk.) Die deutschen Altertümer des Nibelungenliedes u. der Kudrun. gr. 8. vii, 551 S. Cöthen, *O. Schulze Verl.* m. 9.

Hehn (Vict.) Kulturpflanzen u. Haustiere. Historisch-linguist. Skizzen. 6. Aufl., neu hrsg. v. O. Schrader. Mit botan. Beiträgen v. A. Engler. gr. 8. xxvi, 625 S. B., *Gebr. Borntraeger.* m. 12; geb., m. 14.

Herondae Mimiambi accedunt Phoenicis Coronistae, Mattii Mimiamborum fragmenta, iterum edidit Otto Crusius. 8. xxxvi, 156 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.20.

Herondas. Mimiamben. Eingeleitet, übers. u. m. erklär. Bemerkgn. versehen v. Siegfr. Mekler. gr. 8. 67 S. Wien, *C. Konegen.* m. 1.60.

Holder (Alfr.) Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz. 5. Lfg. Lex.-8. Sp. 1025-1280. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Homer's Ilias. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. Karl Frdr. Ameis. 1. Bd. 1. Hft. Gesang I-III. 5. Aufl., bes. v. C. Hentze. gr. 8. x, 139 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. —90.

Karsten (H. T.) Terentiani prologi quot qualesque fuerint et quibus fabularum actionibus destinati a poeta. [Aus "Mnemosyne."] gr. 8. 50 S. Leiden, *E. J. Brill.* m. 1.25.

Keller (A.) Historische Formenlehre der spanischen Sprache. gr. 8. viii, 84 S. *Murrhardt (Württ.) Selbstverlag.* m. 2.

Klemm (Kurt.) Das Ṣaḍviṃcabrahmaṇa m. Proben aus Sāyaṇas Kommentar, nebst e. Uebersetzg. hrsg. v. K. K. Pranāthaka I. gr. 8. iii, 94 S. Gütersloh, *C. Bertelsmann.* m. 2.40.

Koesters (Heinr.) Quaestiones metricae et prosodiacae ad Valerium Flaccum pertinentes. Diss. gr. 8. 96 S. Monasterii. L., *G. Fock.* m. 2.

Körting (Gust.) Encyclopädie u. Methodologie der französischen Philologie. Sep.-Ausg. aus dem 3. Thl. der Encyclopädie u. Methodologie der roman. Philologie. gr. 8. x, 421 S. L., *O. R. Reisland.* m. 6.

Leeuwen (J. F.) Enchiridium dictionis epicae. Pars posterior. gr. 8. lxxii u. S. 275-606. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff.* m. 8.25.

Lehrbücher des Seminars f. orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin. Hrsg. v. dem Director des Seminars. XII. Band. 2 Abthlgn. gr. 8. Berlin, *W. Spemann.* Geb. in Leinw.—XII. Einführung in die nordchinesische Umgangssprache, v. Carl Arendt. 1. Abth. Laufender Text. xx, 625 S. 2. Abth. Chinesischer Text der Uebungsbeispiele. 178 S. m. 48.

Levin (S.) Versuch e. hebräischen Synonymik. I. Die intransitiven Verba der Bewegg. 1. Hälfte. gr. 8. vi, 49 S. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* m. 1.20.

Löbel (D. Theophil.) Deutsch-türkisches Wörterbuch. 2. Aufl. gr. 16. xii, 335 S. Constantinopel, *O. Keil.* Geb. in Leinw., m. 8.

Meyer (Gust.) Neugriechische Studien. I, II. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.*—I. Versuch e. Bibliographie der neugriechischen Mundartenforschung. 104 S. m. 2.—II. Die slavischen, albanischen u. rumänischen Lehnworte im Neugriechischen. 104 S. m. 2.

Müller (D. H.) Epigraphische Denkmäler aus Abessinien nach Abklatschen v. J. Theodore Bent, Esq. Mit 4 Lichtdr.-Taf. u. 1 Schrifttaf. [Aus "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Imp.-4. 82 S. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. 5.

Müller (Hans). Vokabularium zu Cäsars commentarii de bello Gallico. gr. 8. iv, 75 S. Hannover, *C. Meyer.* m. —75; geb., m. —90.

Müller (Joh.) Kritische Studien zu den Naturales quaestiones Senecas. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. 34 S. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. —80.

Mythographi graeci. Vol. I. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner.*—I. Apollodori bibliotheca. Pediasimi libellus de XII Herculis laboribus. Ed. Rich. Wagner. lxxv, 323 S. m. 1 Lichtdr.-Taf. m. 3.60.

Nerrlich (Paul). Das Dogma vom klassischen Altertum in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung. gr. 8. xiv, 400 S. L., *C. L. Hirschfeld.* m. 7.50.

Neue (Frdr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. 3. Bd. Das Verbum. 3. Aufl. v. C. Wagener. 1. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 1–64. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* Subskr.-Pr., m. 1.50; Ladenpr., m. 2.

Pallioppi (Z.) ed Pallioppi (E.) Dizionario dels idioms Romauntschs d'Engiadin ota e bassa. 2. fasc. gr. 8. S. 193–384. Samedan. Basel, *A. Geering.* m. 5.

Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer. Führer durch die Ausstellg. Mit 20 Taf. u. 90 Textbildern. Lex.-8. xxiv, 293 S. Wien, *A. Hölder in Komm.* m. 10.80.

Peiser (F. E.) Der Gesandtschaftsbericht des Hasan ben Ahmed El-Haimi. Hrsg. v. F. E. P. Lex.-8. xxi, 87 S. B., *W. Peiser Verl.* m. 5.

Peters (Karl). Schulwörterbuch zu Ovids sämtlichen Dichtungen. gr. 8. viii, 226 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes.* m. 2.50.

Platonis Apologia. In scholarum usum denuo ed. Mart. Schanz. gr. 8. xii, 43 S. L., *B. Tauchnitz.* m. —60.

— Sammlung ausgewählter Dialoge m. deutschem Kommentar, veranstaltet v. M. Schanz. 3. Bdchn. Apologia. gr. 8. 215 S. Ebd. m. 3.

Plattner (Ph.) Kurzgefasste Schulgrammatik der französischen Sprache. gr. 8. vi, 392 S. Karlsruhe, *J. Bielefeld's Verl.* m. 3.60; Einbd., m. —35.

Plauti (T. Macci) comoediae, recensuit, instrumento critico et prolegomenis auxit Frdr. Ritschellius. Tomi IV, fasc. V (finis). gr. 8. L., *B. G. Teubner.*—IV 5. Cistellaria, recensuit Frdr. Schoell. Accedunt deperditarum fabularum fragmenta a Geo. Goetz recensita. xxxviii, 204 S. m. 5.60.

Radloff (W.) Versuch e. Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte. 6. Lfg. hoch 4. 1. Bd., Sp. 1601–1914 u. 66 S. St. Petersburg. L., *Voss' Sort in Komm.* m. 4.50; 1–6, m. 20.10.

Reinisch (Leo). Die Beɔaue-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. IV. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8. S. 161–204. Wien, *F. Tempsky in Komm.* m. —90.

Reitzenstein (R.) Drei Vermutungen zur Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. [Aus "Festschrift f. Th. Mommsen."] gr. 8. 55 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 1.50.

Reuss (Frdr.) Isokrates Panegyrikus u. der kyprische Krieg. Progr. 4. 15 S. L., *G. Fock.* m. —80.

Rhetores graeci ex recognitione Leon. Spengel. Vol. I. Pars II. Ed. C. Hammer. 8. xvi, 416 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 3.60.

Ries (John). Was ist Syntax? Ein krit. Versuch. gr. 8. ix, 163 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 3.

Rothe (C.) Die Bedeutung der Widersprüche f. die Homerische Frage. Progr. 4. 36 S. B. L., *G. Fock.* m. 1.20.

Saadi's politische Gedichte, übers. v. Frdr. Rückert. gr. 8. v, 178 S. B., *Mayer & Müller.* m. 3.60.

Sallusti Crispi (C.) bellum Catilinae, bellum Jugurthinum, orationes et epistulae ex historiis excerptae. Für den Schulgebr. erklärt v. Thdr. Opitz. 1. Hft. Bellum Catilinae. gr. 8. iv, 51 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. —60.

— bellum Jugurthinum, ex historiis quae exstant orationes et epistulae, scholarum in usum recognovit Gust. Linkerus. Ed. IV curavit Phpp. Klimscha. 12. viii, 129 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn.* Kart., m. —60.

— de coniuratione Catilinae et de bello Jugurthino libri, ex histori-
arum libris V deperditis orationes et epistulae. Erklärt v. Rud. Jacobs.
10. Aufl. v. Hans Wirz. gr. 8. vi, 292 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. 2.10.

Santi (Giovanni). Federigo di Montefeltro, duca di Urbino. Cronaca. Nach dem Cod. Vat. Ottob. 1305 zum ersten Male hrsg. v. Heinr. Holtzinger. Lex. 8. iv, 230 S. St., *W. Kohlhammer.* m. 18.

Schack-Schackenburg (H.) Aegyptologische Studien. 2. Hft. gr. 4. L., *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* —2. Die Sternnetzabschnitten u. die somatischen Relationen der thebanischen Stundentafeln. S. 57–128. m. 5.

Scherffig (Rich.) Französischer Antibarbarus. gr. 8. iv, 189 S. Zittau, *Pahl.* m. 3.50.

Schlemm (Aug.) De fontibus Plutarchi commentationum de audiendis poetis et de fortuna. Diss. gr. 8. 102 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. 2.

Schmeller (J. A.) Carmina Burana. Lateinische u. deutsche Lieder u. Gedichte e. Handschrift des XIII. Jahrh., hrsg. v. J. A. S. 3. Aufl. gr. 8. x, 275 S. m. Abbildgn. Breslau, *W. Koebner.* m. 6.

Schmidlinger (Frz.) Untersuchungen üb. Florus. [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol.," 20. Suppl.-Bd.] gr. 8. 38 S. L., *B. G. Teubner.* m. 1.20.

Schulenburg (A. C. Graf v. der). Die Sprache der Zimshian-Indianer in Nordwest-America. gr. 4. 16, viii, 372 S. Braunschweig, *R. Sattler.* m. 60.

Sonnefeld (Gfr.) Stilistisches u. Wortschatz im Beowulf, ein Beitrag zur Kritik des Epos. Diss. gr. 8. 98 S. Würzburg. L., *G. Fock.* m. 1.60.

Stobaei (Ioa.) Anthologium, recensuerunt Curt. Wachsmuth et Otto Hense. Vol. III, anthologii librum III ab Ottone Hense editum continens. Vol. I. gr. 8. lxxx, 769 S. B., *Weidmann.* m. 20.

Studien, Berliner, f. classische Philologie u. Archaeologie. 14. Bd. 3. Hft. gr. 8. B., *S. Calvary & Co.* —3. Die Berechnung des Kreis-Umfanges bei

Archimedes u. Leonardi Pisano v. H. Weissenborn. 32 S. Subskr.-Pr., m. 1.20; Einzelpr., m. 1.50.

— 15. Bd. Hft. 1, 2, 3. gr. 8. B., *S. Calvary & Co.*—1. De fontibus Vellei Paterculi. Scripsit Frdr. Burmeister. 83 S. Subskr.-Pr., m. 2; Ladenpr., m. 2.50.—2. Zur Entstehung u. ursprünglichen Bedeutung des Ephorats in Sparta von E. v. Stern. v, 62 S. Subskr.-Pr., m. 1.60; Ladenpr., m. 2.—3. Der Schoinos bei den Aegyptern, Griechen u. Römern. Eine metrolog. u. geograph. Untersuchg. v. Wilh. Schwarz. ix, 126 S. Subskr.-Pr., m. 3.20; Einzelpr., m. 4.

Thucydides. Ausgewählte Abschnitte, f. den Schulgebrauch bearb. v. Chr. Harder. 2 Tle. 8. L., *G. Freytag*. m. 1.60.—1. Text. Mit 1 Titelbilde u. 1 Plane v. Syrakus. xiv, 224 S. m. 1.20; geb., m. 1.50.—2. Schülerkommentar. 34 S. Kart., m. —40.

Tobler (Adf.) Vom französischen Versbau alter u. neuer Zeit. Zusammenstellung der Anfangsgründe. 3. Aufl. gr. 8. iv, 164 S. L., *S. Hirzel*. m. 3.60.

Topolovšek (Joh.) Die baskoslavische Spracheinheit. 1. Bd. Einleitung. Vergleichende Lautlehre. Im Anh.: Iro-Slavisches. gr. 8. xlvii, 256 S. Wien, *C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm.* m. 8.

Turretini (François). Le commentaire du San-Ze-King. gr. 8. vii, 115 S. Genève, 1892-94. Basel, *H. Georg*. m. 6.40.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. II. gr. 8. L., *E. Pfeiffer*. m. 6; geb., m. 6.50.

ITALIAN.

De Vito (L.) Esercizi di lettura in lingua tigrina. Roma. L. 4.

Valmaggi (L.) Manuale storico-bibliografico di filologia classica. Torino. 8vo, p. 366. L. 8.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- ΑΘΗΝΑ. Τόμος ἕκτος, τεῦχος πρῶτον. Athens, 1894.
- Baldwin (C. S.) The Inflections and Syntax of the Morte d'Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.50.
- Boerner (Adolfus). De rebus a Graecis inde ab anno 410 usque ad annum 403 a. Chr. n. gestis quaestiones historicae. (Diss.) Göttingen, *Dietrich*, 1894.
- Bonhöfer (Adolf). Die Ethik des Stoikers Epictet. Stuttgart, *F. Enke*, 1894.
- Chaucer. The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Edited from numerous manuscripts by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, Litt. D., LL. D., M. A.; Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon; Fellow of Christ College, Cambridge. To be completed in 6 volumes. Vol. I. Romaunt of the Rose; Minor Poems. 8vo, 568 pp. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. Buckram, \$4.00 net.—The remaining 5 volumes will be published at short intervals during the present year. The complete set of 6 volumes is offered to subscribers at \$17.50 net, payable strictly in advance.
- Ciceros Rede für T. Annii Milo. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Hermann Nohl. Zweite, verb. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1894. Geb., 60 pf.
- Classical Studies in honour of Henry Drisler. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. \$4.
- Cybulski (Stephanus). Tabulae quibus antiquitates Graecae et Romanae illustrantur. Leipzig, *K. F. Kochler*, 1893.
- Dictionnaire général de la langue française du commencement du XVIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours, par MM. A. Hatzfeld, A. Darmesteter et Ant. Thomas. Treizième livraison. Paris, *Ch. Delagrave*, 1894. @ 1 fr.
- Droysen (J. G.) Kleine Schriften zur alten Geschichte. Zweiter Band. Leipzig, *Veit & Co.*, 1894.
- Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. April, May, June. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1894. \$3 per annum.
- Ellis (Robinson). The Fables of Phaedrus. An inaugural lecture. London, *Henry Frowde*, 1894. 1s.
- English Dictionary, A New, on Historical Principles, ed. by James A. H. Murray. Part III, 2. EVERYBODY-EZOD. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. \$1.25.
- Euripides. Bacchae. Ed. with introduction and notes by A. H. Cruickshank. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1893. \$1.
- Iphigenie auf Tauris, erkl. von F. G. Schöne u. H. Köchly. Vierte Aufl. Neue Bearbeitung von Ewald Bruhn. (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1894. 2 m. 40 pf.

Euripides, The Tragedies of, in English verse. By Arthur S. Way. In three volumes. Vol. I. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1894. \$2.

Fuchs (Josef). Der zweite punische Krieg und seine Quellen. Polybius u. Livius nach strategisch-taktischen Gesichtspunkten beleuchtet. Die Jahre 219 u. 218 mit Ausschluss des Alpenüberganges. Wiener-Neustadt, *Carl Blumrich*, 1894.

Gayley (C. M.) and Bradley (C. B.) Suggestions to Teachers of English in the Secondary Schools. Berkeley (Cal.), *The University*, 1894.

Goebel (Julius). Amerika in der deutschen Dichtung. Abgedruckt aus der Festschrift zu Rudolf Hillebrandt's 70. Geburtstag.

Grundriss der romanischen Philologie, unter Mitwirkung von zahlreichen Gelehrten herausg. von Gustav Gröber. II. Band, 2. Abteilung, 3. Lieferung. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1894. 2 m.

Gummere (F. B.) Old English Ballads. (Athenaeum Press Series.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.35.

Harper (W. R.) and Burgess (I. B.) Inductive Studies in English Grammar. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, 1894. 40 cts.

Heberdey (Rudolf). Die Reisen des Pausanias in Griechenland. Mit 2 Karten. (Abhandlungen des archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien. Herausg. von O. Benndorf u. E. Bormann. Heft X.) Leipzig, *G. Freytag*.

Index, The Annual Literary, 1893. Ed. by W. I. Fletcher and R. R. Bowker. New York, *Office of the Publishers' Weekly*, 1894.

Johnson (Franciscus). De coniunctivi et optativi usu Euripideo in enuntiatis finalibus et condicionalibus. (Diss.) Berlin, 1893.

Jurenka (Hugo). Ueber die Wichtigkeit, die gegenwärtigen Richtungen und die Aufgaben der Pindar-Studien. (Verhandlungen der 42. Philologenversammlung.) Wien, 1893.

Kock (Th.) Ausgewählte Tragödien des Aristophanes. Erstes Bändchen. Die Wolken. 4te Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1894. 2 m. 40 pf.

Kolsen (Adolf). Guirant von Bornelh, der Meister des Trobadors. (Diss.) Berlin, 1894.

Lucani (M. Annaei), De bello civili. Liber Primus. Publié avec appareil critique, commentaire et introduction par Paul Le Jay. Paris, *C. Klincksieck*, 1894.

MacArthur (Arthur). Biography of the English Language. Washington, D. C., *W. D. Lowdermilk & Co.*, 1894.

Magnusson (Peter Magnus). Some Applications of Logical and Psychological Principles to Grammar. (Thesis.) University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1893.

Maxwell (W. H.) First Book in English. New York, Cinc., Chic., *American Book Co.*, 1894. 40 cts.

Mellé (Rosine). The Contemporary French Writers. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894.

de Mirmont (H. de la Ville). Apollonius de Rhodes et Virgile. Bordeaux, 1894.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of. Ed. by J. W. Bright. Vol. IX, No. 2. Contents: III. King Lear, a Study of Shakspeare's Dramatic Method. By T. R. Price.—IV. Lope de Vega's 'Comedia.' Sin Secreto No Ay Amor. By H. A. Rennert.—V. The Psychological Basis of Phonetic Law and Analogy. By G. E. Karsten. Baltimore, *The Association*, 1894.

Muller (H. C.) Neugriechische Studien u. neugriechische Dialektforschung. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*, 1894.

Neue (Fr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. Dritter Band: Das Verbum. Dritte, sehr vermehrte Auflage. Erste Lfg. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1894. Subs.-preis, 1 m. 50 pf.

Oberziner (L.) I destini del progresso umano. Roma, *E. Loescher & Co.*, 1894.

Phyfe (W. H. P.) Seven Thousand Words Often Mispronounced. Third ed. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1894. \$1.

Rambeau (Adolf). On the Value of Phonetics in Teaching Modern Languages. Reprinted from 'Die neueren Sprachen.' Marburg i. H., *N. G. Elwert*, 1894.

Revue des revues et publications d'académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. Année et tome XVII. (Fascicules publiés en 1892.) Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1893.

Rogers (A. M.) Emendations in Aeschylus. Ed. by L. L. Forman. Baltimore, *John Murphy & Co.*, 1894.

Sallusti (C. S. Crispi) De coniuratione Catilinae et De Bello Jugurthino libri, ex Historiarum libris quinque deperditis orationes et epistulae. Erkl. von Rudolf Jacobs. Zehnte, verb. Aufl., von Hans Wirz. (Haupt u. Sauppesche Sammlung.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1894.

Sophokles, erkl. von F. W. Schneidewin. Fünftes Bändchen. Elektra. Neunte Aufl., bes. von August Nauck. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1893. 1 m. 50 pf.

Stobaei (Ioannis) Anthologium recensuerunt Curtius Wachsmuth et Otto Hense. Vol. III. Anthologii Lib. Tertium continens. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1894. 20 m.

Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica. Volume Secondo. Firenze, *G. C. Sansoni*, 1894.

Studia Sinaitica. The Syriac version of Plutarch De capienda ex inimicis utilitate. By Eberhard Nestle. London, *C. J. Clay & Sons*, 1894. 2s.

Thucydides. Book III. Ed. on the basis of the Classen-Steup edition. By Charles Forster Smith. Boston and London, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.75.

Tolman (H. C.) Notes to his Persian Inscriptions. Chapel Hill, N. C., *The University Press*, 1894.

Van Daell (C. L.) A Preparatory German Reader for Beginners. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. 45 cts.

Weil (Henri). Plusieurs fables de Babrios sur tablettes de cire. Extrait du Journal des Savants. Mons, 1894.

White (John Williams). Περὶ τοῦ Πελαργικοῦ ἐπὶ Περικλέους. Extract from the Ἐφημερίς ἀρχαιολογική. Athens, 1894.

Widgery (William Henry), Schoolmaster. A description and critical account of his life, work and character. By William K. Hill. London, *David Nutt*, 1894.

Winer's (G. B.) Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms. Achte Aufl., neu bearb. von P. W. Schmiedel. I. Theil. Einleitung u. Formenlehre. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*, 1894. 2 m. 60 pf.

Xenophon's Anabasis, The First Four Books of. Ed. by W. W. Goodwin and J. W. White. Revised edition. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1894. \$1.65.

Zierner-Gillhausen. Lateinische Schulgrammatik. I. Teil: Formenlehre. II. Teil: Syntax. Berlin, *R. Gaertner's Buchhandlung*, 1893.